

1. The first step in the process of developing a business plan is to conduct a thorough market research. This involves identifying the target market, understanding their needs and preferences, and analyzing the competitive landscape. Market research can be conducted through various methods, including surveys, interviews, and focus groups.

2. Once the market research is complete, the next step is to develop a clear and concise business plan. This plan should outline the company's mission, vision, and goals, as well as the strategies and tactics for achieving them. It should also include financial projections and a detailed description of the products or services being offered.

3. After the business plan is developed, the next step is to secure the necessary funding. This can be done through various sources, including banks, venture capitalists, and angel investors. It is important to have a solid business plan in place when seeking funding, as it will demonstrate the viability of the business and the potential for return on investment.

4. Once funding is secured, the next step is to launch the business. This involves setting up the necessary infrastructure, including a website, social media presence, and distribution channels. It also involves implementing the marketing and sales strategies outlined in the business plan.

5. Finally, the business should be monitored and evaluated regularly to ensure it is on track to achieve its goals. This involves tracking key performance indicators (KPIs) and making adjustments as needed. It is important to stay flexible and adaptable in the face of changing market conditions.

K 140.
N 1847.





THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

A
R E P L Y
TO THE
“END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY;”
AS DISCUSSED IN A
Correspondence

BETWEEN
A SUPPOSED SOCIETY OF PROTESTANTS,
AND THE
REV. JOHN MILNER, D.D. F.S.A.
BISHOP OF CASTABALA, &c.

BY THE
REV. RICHARD GRIER, A.M.
VICAR OF TEMPLEBODANE, IN THE DIOCESE OF CLOYNE,
AND CHAPLAIN TO HIS EXCELLENCY
EARL TALBOT,
LORD LIEUTENANT OF IRELAND.

Doperu—“that baffled system of superstition and iniquity, which hath
been confuted a thousand times, and which, perhaps, no author ever at-
tacked without giving it a mortal wound.”

JORTIN ON ECCL. HIST. Vol. iii. p. 208.

L O N D O N :
PRINTED FOR T. CADELL, IN THE STRAND ;
R. MILIKEN, DUBLIN ; EDWARDS AND SAVAGE, CORK ; AND
W. BLACKWOOD, EDINBURGH.

1821.

BX

1751

M636eZg

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

LORD VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH,

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT.

MY LORD,

IF a devoted attachment to the Established Religion of the State; if a deep interest about its most important concerns; if high station and high character; and if talent united to integrity—point out one individual more than another, whom I could with the greatest propriety address in the present instance, I humbly conceive your Lordship to be THAT INDIVIDUAL. Impressed with this idea, I feel anxious to acquire for the following pages, upon which I have expended some portion of time and thought, all the credit to be derived from the sanction of your Lordship's name.

DEDICATION.

It cannot have escaped your Lordship's observation, that Popish writers have of late years manifested an increased activity in the diffusion of their principles; that they have assumed a loftier tone and used a bolder language, than they have been accustomed to do; and as this may more particularly be said of the Rev. Doctor Milner, a temperate Refutation of the pernicious errors, which he has sent abroad in his latest publication, appeared to me to be not only expedient, but *necessary*.

But, feeling as I do my own inability to accomplish my design to the full extent of my wishes, I beg leave respectfully to appeal to your Lordship's candour for indulgence on the occasion; while I offer up a fervent prayer, that, as our pure Church, with the existence of which, vital piety and true religion, no less than the public good, are intimately connected, has withstood to this day the assaults of infidelity and irreligion; of superstition and enthusiasm: so

DEDICATION.

it may, by the Divine blessing, be preserved for ages yet to come.

I have now the honour to entreat your Lordship's acceptance of this humble tribute of my respect, and that your Lordship will believe me to be, with grateful acknowledgments for past instances of condescension and kindness,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's most obliged,

And very humble Servant,

RICHARD GRIER.

Middleton, May 1, 1821.

CORRIGENDA.

Page	Line
69	26, read <i>have</i> .
99	11, read <i>compels</i> .
160	28, supply the word <i>mentio</i> .
197	27, read <i>administraverit</i> .
204	13, supply the words, <i>it to</i> .
205	15, supply the word, <i>to</i> .
243	16, read <i>cæpit</i> .
270	10, dele the word, <i>not</i> .
397	8, read Hibernian <i>Bible Society</i> .

PREFATORY REMARKS.

WHEN I first conceived the idea of vindicating the exposition given of certain texts in my ANSWER to Ward's Errata of the Protestant Bible, from Doctor Milner's animadversions; my thoughts did not extend beyond the individual point. But having accomplished my design in this respect, in a manner at least to satisfy myself, other objects presented themselves to my view, without the attainment of which, what I had done, seemed to be incomplete. Possessed with this feeling, I was insensibly led on to the production of the following REPLY.

I am perfectly aware of the responsibility incurred, when I descend into the controversial *arena* with a disputant so versatile and long practised as this gentleman undoubtedly is; but I equally well know, that I sustain, at the same time, the cause of truth; that, by the ardent prosecution of it, I best redeem the solemn pledge by

which I bound myself on entering into the ministry of the Church; and that, should the attempt, which I make, prove unsuccessful, its failure will not involve any consequences prejudicial to the cause itself. For, since I only profess to speak my own sentiments, I alone am chargeable with any errors, into which I may have been inadvertently betrayed.

If TRUTH be the *end* of controversy, Doctor Milner could not have selected a title less expressive of such an object; nor of the means used to attain it, than that, which he has prefixed to his last publication. The work to which I allude, assumes the specious name of **THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY**; but, were it his design to establish the very opposite to what he professes to do, he could not have pursued a course better calculated to effect his purpose, than that, which he has taken on the present occasion. In vain may the reader expect, on opening the pages of this veteran Polemic, to meet with what should always characterize controversial writing—courteousness, good temper, candour towards an adversary, and modera-

tion in defence of the writer's own opinions. In vain may he look for impartial decisions on the merits of conflicting opinions; for candid inquiry, for fair argument, or for fair representation. Such hopes would be illusory in the extreme; since, in almost every page, he will find passages perverted from their original meaning, misquotations, garbled extracts from the fathers, lying legends, the false miracles, and arrogant pretensions of the Church of Rome, and the jargon and sophistry of the schoolmen; together with a revival of all the calumny, falsehood, and abuse, which Gregory Martin in the sixteenth, and Thomas Ward in the seventeenth, centuries, have heaped on the CHURCH OF ENGLAND, its CLERGY, and its ORDINANCES. When, in addition to this, it is considered, that he commences and concludes his book with an attack on our Prelacy, far exceeding in virulence that of Chaloner, Walmsley, Hawarden, Plowden, Drumgoole, or Gandolphy; and that the intermediate parts correspond with the extremes, we can have no hesitation in pronouncing upon the *end*, which he had in view, and in saying, that he could not have

adopted a less appropriate Title for his precious Digest, than that which he has given it.

His Book, which consists of *five hundred and fifty-five* pages of imperial octavo, divided into three parts, has, according to his own account, lain dormant during twice the period prescribed by the poet, within the *Penetrals* of his study; receiving each day such embellishments from his master-hand, as might exhibit his Portraiture in its most attractive form. Nor has it been among the least artful of his devices, to set up a fictitious society of Protestant Correspondents, and to have shaped the Letters ascribed to them in such a way, as to make his own replies appear triumphant.

It is admitted, that the coarse and ribaldrous trash to be met with in Martin's Discoverie, and Ward's Errata, finds no place in Doctor Milner's pages; yet we can trace in his specious and sophistical language, and more polished style, the same unmitigated severity towards the Established Church, and the identical ultramontane principles, which characterize their works,

and which, during their banishment, impelled the * one to recommend assassination, and the † other to foment treason, in their native country. Such diabolical acts are not, to be sure, attributable to this gentleman; but how can he be answerable for the consequences, which a work under the magic of his name, will have produced among every class of the Popish community? And, when he so blends politics with polemical discussion, as to induce those, who are hostile to the Church of England to believe, that the wholesome restraint, which the Laws necessarily impose on them for its preservation, is a *direct* persecution; and this at a time, when he furnishes in his own person a practical comment on the tolerant

* FOULIS states, "that the better to procure Queen Elizabeth's ruin, there was a little book composed, and called a Treatise of Schism, which among other things exhorted the women at Court to act the same part against the Queen, as Judith had done, with commendations, against Holofernes. The author of this pernicious pamphlet was one Gregory Martin." p. 338. CAMBDEN testifies to the same effect.—HIST. OF ELIZ. 1584.

† Ward kept up a treasonable correspondence with the rebels at the period of the Revolution in England. See PRESERVATIVE AGAINST POPERY, vol. iii. Tit. ix. p. 38.

spirit of the age ; I ask, must he not be aware of the fatal consequences likely to result from the exercise of such mischievous ingenuity ?

The exclusion of Roman Catholics from power, offices, and emoluments, furnishes Doctor Milner with a grand topic for declamation. Thus, he says, * “ that a civil incapacity amounts to a real persecution ; ” and that this is doubly severe, as it arises from “ a belief in a *particular* doctrine.” But he here misstates both cause and effect. He misstates the *cause* ; for he must be conscious, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation, to which he alludes, is not, at this moment, the reason why Roman Catholics are excluded from political power. It originates in a very different cause ; in a cause, which diminishes their loyalty to their legitimate Sovereign ; while it proclaims their devotedness to a foreign Ecclesiastic. I mean the SUPREMACY OF THE POPE. But Transubstantiation is the touchstone of Popery ; it is the test by which a rigid adhe-

* END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY, Letters xxxvi. and xlix.

rent to the Church of Rome can be found out; and therefore, the Legislature have determined, that the abjuration of it shall constitute the eligibility of persons to sit in Parliament, and to possess honours and emoluments. Taken by itself, this doctrine is perfectly harmless, as far as the State is concerned, because it is of a speculative nature, like prayers for the dead, ending where it begins, in the mind, and consequently is not subject to political cognizance; but it is *inseparably connected* with other doctrines, which are not so. It is, in short, the best criterion that could be devised to discover diluted loyalty. If we look to the practice of the Romish Church, we shall find most of its other doctrines operate, only as it were, partially and occasionally. There is no absolute compulsion, in theory at least, to worship images and relics; and monastic vows are generally at the option of the individual. But Transubstantiation is always a prominent part of Popery. It was the test, by which Protestants were discovered in Queen Mary's reign; and which was proposed to the martyrs and exiles in France, and to all the victims of the Inquisition.

As therefore, it has been at all times, the grand * point of distinction between Protestants and Roman Catholics; and as it is that, which is of perpetual recurrence, perhaps the only one which is so, in the Church of Rome; the Legislature have acted wisely in constituting it a test of Popery, as the Popish Church had before made it, a test of Protestantism.

Doctor Milner also misstates the *effect*. For in the first place, † civil disability and persecution are not convertible terms. To say that they are so, is to confound things, which are in their own nature perfectly dis-

* In that admirable Epitome of clerical duty, BISHOP MANT'S primary Charge to his Clergy; after adverting to the consequences to which the doctrine of Christ's *corporeal* presence in the Sacrament led in the sixteenth century, his Lordship extends his observations to every point, which affects the well-being of our National Church. Thus, while he stimulates his clergy to use every mild endeavour to dissipate the delusion, under which the modern Romish professor lies, he cautions them against opening a door to the extravagances of the *enthusiast*. (pp. 43, 52.) His remarks are urged with such unaffected modesty and good sense, that I cannot but hail his advancement to the Episcopal Bench, as another splendid accession to the talents, learning, and orthodoxy of the Irish Prelacy.

† See Chap. xvi. p. 356.

inct. Secondly, persecution enforces a renunciation of religious principles, and the adoption of a particular creed, at the risk of liberty, property, or life itself; while exclusion from power only debars persons from filling certain offices, without trenching on liberty of thought. It may hence be fairly inferred, that the political disabilities of the Roman Catholics, do not *solely* arise, as Doctor Milner avers, from their belief in Transubstantiation; but because they divide their allegiance between their own King and a foreign Jurisdiction. In a word, their disabilities are only such as they choose to impose on themselves. As a further proof, that the doctrine in question has no operative effect; and that it is not raised by the Popish Church itself as an insurmountable barrier to accommodation; it may be observed, that the Pope proposed to sanction the *English Liturgy*, and the use of the Communion in both kinds, (and would repeat his proposal tomorrow, were it likely to be accepted on the same terms) provided * Queen Elizabeth

* That wise Princess well knew, had she admitted the Pope's *Supremacy*, that he would have denied her *Legiti-*

would acknowledge his SUPREMACY. The fact is, that the believers in Transubstantiation * conformed to the Church of England for the first ten years of her reign, before they formed distinct congregations.

Doctor Milner says, that as Roman Catholics “ have abjured the Pope’s jurisdiction in all civil and temporal cases,” they should, therefore, be admissible to offices and power. However, the policy of such a measure is more than questionable. They admit, it is true, that obedience in temporal matters is due to the King; but then, as they acknowledge a foreign Head in ecclesiastical affairs, there can be no doubt, when their civil allegiance to the former interfered with their spiritual allegiance to the latter, which duty would † yield to the

macy. See SHEPHERD’S INTRODUCTION to the Book of Common Prayer, p. lxiv.

* HEYLIN’S REFORM. p. 303. and BISHOP OF WINCHESTER’S Elem. of Theol. vol. ii. p. 26. Doctor Jeremy Taylor says, “ from *primo* of Elizabeth to *undecimo*, the Papists made no scruple of coming to our Church,” &c. as in note †, CHAPTER vi. p. 142.

† BELLARMINE says, “ that when the *jus divinum* and the *jus humanum* are opposed to each other, the latter must be sacrificed to the former.”—*De Romano Pontifice*, lib. v. c. 7.

other. History and experience shew, that it is not always possible to distinguish between civil and religious concerns. It was from this conviction, that resistance was given to the Papal encroachments in England by *Popish* Kings and *Popish* Parliaments, even before the era of the Reformation. It is to this we owe the statute of the 30th of Charles the Second, that fence and safeguard of our lives and liberties. And it was this conviction, operating on the mind of the distinguished character, who framed the Roman Catholic Bills now under discussion in Parliament, which induced him to devise, what he conceived, *adequate* * securities, as substitutes for those about to be given up.

* One Titular Bishop says, the security Bill should be *indignantly rejected*; another, that it would go to *de-catholicize* Ireland; while Mr. O'Connel compares it to the *Infernal Machine*! In this way do the Irish Roman Catholics receive the boon which the first men of the age have designed for them. The fact is, that no political regulation, consistent with the safety of our Church, can, in the nature of things, satisfy them. We should, therefore, make our stand, and not relinquish the vantage ground on which we have been happily established by the Constitution.

Shall I not add the former instance of the refusal of the *veto* to our KING, in the appointment of their Bishops, as a proof how strongly the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope clashes with the temporal concerns of this Empire. In truth, it would defy the most subtle casuist always to draw a line of distinction between them. I therefore conclude, that, as the Pope is known to possess unbounded influence over his Episcopal Clergy, who, in their turn, have no less influence over their subordinates; and these again over their respective flocks: were Roman Catholics vested with power on the terms prescribed by Doctor Milner, or even on those laid down in the Bills now before Parliament; they must anxiously seek the * subversion of

* We are not left to conjecture, or to rational inference on this head; since, in Doctor Milner's THEOLOGICAL JUDGMENT on the Bills pending in Parliament, not only is the doctrine, which relates to the *deposition* of Princes recognized, but an explicit avowal set forth, that the Roman Catholic Clergy of the United Kingdom *cannot* forego such communications with the Pope, as have either a direct, or indirect tendency to overthrow our Church. FIRST, says he, "we declare, that it is *contrary* to the doctrine of the (Roman) Catholic Church to condemn upon oath the

what they deem an heretical establishment, and the substitution of that religion, out of which they believe *no person* can be saved; and that the more conscientiously they are impressed with this idea, the more desirous they must be to effect their wishes.

mere deposing doctrine, as damnable and heretical." SECONDLY. "We cannot bind ourselves *never* to have any communication with the Pope, tending *directly* or *indirectly* to overthrow, or disturb the Protestant Church; as ALL our preaching, writing, and *ministring* tend indirectly to this effect." The manly candour of this language reflects the highest credit on Doctor Milner. Here is no mincing. We are told distinctly, and by the first authority too, that every thought, word, and act of the Roman Catholic priesthood have a reference to this one fixed object, the extinction of the Protestant Religion; and that to this end, all the energies of their souls are directed. Shall not the solemn intimation here given be attended to by the Legislature, while it produces, as the natural result, on the part of the Established Clergy, a corresponding vigilance, activity, and zeal in defence of what is so dear to them, as men and as Christians; and while it convinces them, that the machinations of their adversaries for its annihilation, although unseen and unnoticed, are nevertheless carried on with a degree of sleepless perseverance, which would do credit to a better cause?

Since the preceding note was committed to the printer's hands, the Popish Bills have been rejected in the House of Lords, by a majority strikingly remarkable, on account of its coincidence with the *number* of the Articles of our Church!

I am aware, how unpalatable language of this kind will be to my Roman Catholic friends and neighbours, and that I shall probably incur the charge of bigotry, if not of something worse. But such a charge, if made, will be unsupported by a shade of truth. If, indeed, to be faithful, sincere, and unwavering; if to “hold fast the form of sound words,” inculcated by the Church to which I belong; and if to maintain my faith with integrity—be bigotry, I must plead guilty to the charge; but in no other case whatever. But I shall hope for better things at their hands. Among the Roman Catholic gentry, I know many estimable characters, and most anxiously do I desire to reciprocate with them offices of kindness and good-will. And although my disposition towards several of their clergy be the same; yet I fear, that so long as the exclusive character hangs about them, it is vain to expect belief for my professions, or credit for my sincerity. Notwithstanding this, I claim the indulgence, to which they shall in turn be entitled; of expressing my sentiments without restraint.

Were I to hazard a word of advice to

my Roman Catholic countrymen, it would be this. That, as the Parliament of the United Kingdom must, on the rational principle of self-preservation, inviolably maintain the bulwarks raised by the constitution against the superstition and idolatry of the Church of Rome, in its * Corporation and Test Acts, they should abjure a point, which restrains them in the exercise of many natural, civil, and religious duties. I allude to the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Pope. They are called on to do so, by the laws of their country, by the repeal of penal statutes, by the concession of several valuable privileges, and by the enjoyment of the most enlightened † Toleration. May

* BLACKSTONE calls them “two bulwarks erected against perils from non-conformists of *all* denominations.” By the former, the oath of Supremacy is enjoined, and by the latter, the declaration against Transubstantiation is required, vol. iv. p. 58.—See also BURN’S Eccl. Law, vol. iii. p. 17.

† It should rather be called Encouragement—*witness* the rich endowment of Maynooth College by our Protestant Parliament; the establishment of Popish seminaries under the direction of Jesuits; the erection of splendid edifices in our Metropolis, and in our large towns, for Roman Ca-

this invitation, which makes so forcible an appeal to their reason and good sense, be accepted by them ; and may the only emancipation their wants require, be effected by themselves—an emancipation from *spiritual bondage and tyranny*.

As connected with this subject, I feel it necessary to lay before the reader a few extracts from the Notes to the Rhemish Testament, which every true Roman Catholic regards as of equal authority with the text ; inasmuch as they express the sentiments of the *one* infallible Church. But were they even not considered so, the effects would be the same ; since the Scripture *is*, as it is interpreted, not only to the lower, but to such of the higher classes, as either cannot, or will not judge for themselves.

1. The Note on DEUT. xvii. 12, intimates, “that the church guides of the New Testament ought to punish *with death* such as proudly refuse to obey their decisions on controversial points.” 2. MATT. xiii. 29,

tholic worship ; and of chapels without number throughout this country : the chief contributors to all which, are members of the Established Church.

“ the good must tolerate the evil, when it is too strong, &c. otherwise heretics ought to be *chastised* or *executed*.” 3. That on JOHN, xv. 7, says, “ the prayer of a Protestant *cannot* be heard by heaven.” 4. ACTS, x. 9. “ The Church service of England being in *heresy* and *schism*, is therefore not only unprofitable, but *damnable*.” 5. IBID. xxxviii. 22. “ The Church of God, viz. that of Rome, calling the Protestants’ doctrine *heresy*, in the worst part there can be, and in the worst sort that ever was, doth *rightly* and *most justly*.” 6. First of TIM. iii. 12. “ The speeches, preachings, and writings of Protestants are *pestiferous*, *contagious*, and *creeping like a cancer*, and therefore *never* to be heard.” 7. HEB. v. 7. “ The translators of the English Protestant Bible ought to be *abhorred* to the *depths of hell*.” 8. IBID. “ A Catholic man should give the *curse*, the *execration*, and the *anathema* to heretics, though they were *his parents*.”

* Such are some of the milder specimens

* A Letter has been lately published and addressed to His MAJESTY, the KING, containing a judicious selection of *sixty-one* of those dangerous and uncharitable notes.

of Roman Catholic affection for their Protestant brethren, and such the *pious* and *orthodox* annotations with which * Doctor Milner says, the English Bible of his Church is enriched! But to me, they appear to breathe a spirit, which is not only a reproach to the present enlightened age; but which would have disgraced the darkest and most bigotted. Here it is openly avowed, that the clergy of the Church of Rome have a right to inflict death on those, who are disobedient to their decrees; that Protestants are to be tolerated from *prudential* motives, not from *principle*; and that they must not be too suddenly extirpated, but that the tares shall be permitted to

Stockdale, 1820. At the last Popish Board held in Dublin, Mr. O'Connel denounced "the doctrines contained in the Rhemish Annotations as damnable, &c." and declared, that he would not remain *one* hour longer a Roman Catholic, if he thought it essential to the profession of the R. C. faith, to hold them. With a display of liberality equally affected, the Board appointed a Committee to prepare a disavowal of the offensive notes; but before this object was accomplished, it very wisely *dissolved itself*! The fact is, they dare not disclaim them; as their church expressly forbids the interference of the laity touching ecclesiastical affairs.—See LAB. Concil. Gen. tom. ii. p. 617.

* See his LIFE of Bishop Chaloner, p. 19.

grow until they can be *conveniently* eradicated from the soil. I should add, that Mr. Gandolphy too, after justifying the *Inquisition*, says in the same gentle spirit with the notes ; * “ that a Protestant has *no* religious principle at all !”

While, therefore, the Roman Catholic Clergy of the present day maintain an exposition of the Scriptures so worthy of the Priests of Bonner’s school ; while they publicly instruct their flocks, that their Protestant neighbours are the objects of divine vengeance, and describe the offices of charity which they perform, as insidious snares to entrap the inexperienced to sin against heaven ; while such grave authority declares our English Version of the Scriptures to be false and blasphemous interpretations of God’s Holy Word, contrived for the wicked purpose of destroying Christianity, and extinguishing the light of the Gospel, and designed for the propagation of opinions in direct opposition to Christ’s Revelation : while, I say, the Roman Catholic Pastor communicates such instruc-

* Defence of the Ancient Faith, vol. iv. p. 250.

tion to his flock, can we be surprised, that they should look on their Protestant countrymen with distrust and aversion? In truth, as long as such a state of things continues to exist, I shall never admit the policy of investing them with either legislative or executive authority. This, I believe, to be the general feeling of Protestants, and I consider it a signal instance of the interposition of Providence, that the bigotry and intolerance of the republishers of those notes should rouse them to a sense of their danger, and point out the increased necessity of abiding by the securities which have hitherto protected them; not from creeds and theories, which they deride, but from unrelenting hatred and avowed anathema. But I feel, I have fallen into a devious track by at all adverting to the Roman Catholic question; and if I must exculpate myself for having done so, be it my apology, that I have only followed whither Doctor Milner has led me, and that I should have considered my REPLY defective, were I to have left his observations on this head unnoticed.

In making these prefatory remarks, an

allusion to the introduction of the Jesuits into the United Kingdom cannot be avoided. * Two rich seminaries of this intriguing order of men are established among us. Their influence is gradually, although insensibly gaining ground; and if not checked, will soon betray itself in its effects. Their former devotion to the peculiar interests of the Pope acquired for them the title of his BODY GUARD, and when animated by the same principles and in pursuit of the same object as before, they will, as they gain strength, be seen to adopt the same course of action, and to render themselves deserving of the same distinctive appellation. As, however, the political circumstances, which led to their establishment in this

* At Stonyhurst, in Lancashire, and at Mount Browne, in the county of Kildare. The Bishop of Chester, in his luminous and argumentative speech on the Popish question, April 16, 1821, stated, that several Jesuits had lately arrived in his diocese from Liege, and held an ordination of their order, *sub titulo paupertatis*. These are alarming facts, and richly deserve the attention of Protestant England. It were well, indeed, for the interests of true religion, that the fate predicted by Archbishop Browne, awaited them; but, alas! their revival among us, at a time in which they are expelled from Russia, only aggravates the evil, which we already so deeply deplore.

country cannot be now controlled; it is imperative on our governing powers to watch with suspicious vigilance these men and their cause; to attend with minute circumspection to their machinations for the diffusion of Popery, and as they will tolerate a confederacy thus leagued against our Established Religion, at least to guard against the further increase of Popish infection. I feel the more earnest in pressing the consideration of this subject on their attention, as I view the existence of the Jesuits in the British isles, as among the most awful of the signs of the times. But to return to Doctor Milner.

When this gentleman objects to us the extravagances of Luther and Zuinglius; the blasphemies of Paine, and the impious reveries of Joanna Southcote, I feel myself no way called on for a vindication. If Luther *travestied parts of the Bible, and could not divest himself of his wild notions about exorcisms and the adjurations of devils; and if Zuinglius, even after he threw off the shackles of Popery still con-

* See Chap. vi. p. 141.

sidered himself under the protection of his guardian angel; such things do not affect the question between us and Roman Catholics. Those Reformers did not found our Church; nor are we led by their *ipse dixits*. To objections like these, Doctor Milner seems to attach great consequence; but how weak must be the cause, which requires such miserable support? But were it essential to the point, what an infinitely greater number of impieties, blasphemies, and absurdities could be brought home to the legendary heroes of his own Church; without a reference either to the **Liber Aureus* of St. Francis, or the *Alcoran* of the Franciscans.

I can feel little surprise at his attack on the characters of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, and at the intemperance with which he assails the Church of England, on its first emergence from Papal darkness, when

* This rare and curious little Book is intitled, *LIBER AUREUS inscriptus Liber Conformitatum Vitæ S. Francisci*; but having been successfully burlesqued in the *Alcoranus Franciscorum*, the Popish Church got ashamed of it, and issued orders for its suppression, as far as was possible!

I see him pouring out all the virulence of his fury on several of our most distinguished Prelates. As to the venerable Fathers of the Reformation, if their opinions on doctrinal points were erroneous, and if they even betrayed an intolerance of spirit; it should be recollected, that they were candid enough to retract their errors, and that their intolerance was mainly attributable to the Church, which they had abandoned. But why reproach the Church of England with its earliest frailties? When struggling with the colossal power, which would fain have strangled it in its cradle; it would have been surprising indeed, if it did not betray the weakness and imperfection of infancy. But let it be viewed in its present matured state, and it will be found minutely to accord with its beautiful model—the primitive Church of Christ: in its Faith and Practice; in its Rites and Ordinances; in the character of its Clergy; and in the pure and Apostolic form of its Doctrine. And if it even have thrown open the door to Sectarianism, as Doctor Milner so repeatedly objects; the greatest evils,

with which that is attendant, are as nothing compared with the spiritual slavery, which Popery imposes on its votaries.

When he taunts us with the extravagant conceits of those few of our brethren, whom he denominates * *Evangelical*; can he se-

* As an orthodox member of the Church of England, I do not hesitate to say, that the principles of the *Evangelical*, or, as they may more properly be called, of the *calvinian-methodistical* preachers of the present day, are as incompatible with the sound Apostolic doctrine of the Established Church, as the corruptions of Popery. If the tenet of *exclusive salvation* be found among the latter, do not the former hold that of *Election*, and its tremendous consequent, of which the author himself was forced to say, "*horribile fateor decretum.*" If the one proclaims the superior merit of *works*, the other dwells upon that of *faith*. And if the Roman Catholic decries reason, can those be said to make a proper use of it, who subject it to their feelings, or their fancies? I shall not pursue the parallelism farther, but content myself with noticing the justness of Swift's homely similitude of the two pair of compasses; that if a leg of each be held together, while the others are equally widened, although they seem at first to go off in adverse directions, they will ultimately meet at the opposite side! Thus, while Popery and Calvinism are performing their semivolutions, and as it were tilting against each other at stated intervals, the Church of England, preserving the golden mean, abides at the centre immoveably fixed.

With respect to Regeneration and Election, on which

riously expect, that we should enter on a justification? The aberrations of those gentlemen from the orthodoxy of our Church, are like spots on the sun ; they are either lost in the halo of its brightness, or are only known to exist, when their eccentricity forces them into notice.

As little are we concerned about “the numerous sects, into which,” he says, “the Reformed Church have divided themselves.” But when Doctor Milner raises an objection on this head, he seems to forget, how much greater and more violent divisions and dissensions have prevailed in the Church of Rome, and continue to this day to distract it, notwithstanding all its boasted unity of faith, than any that have occurred within the bosom of the Church of England : witness, the eternal war carried on between the Franciscans and the Dominicans ; the

points our Evangelical Praters think proper to be dissentient from our venerable Church ; I shall only remark, that by doing so, they hold out every encouragement to the ravings of fanatics about the *pangs* of the *new-birth*, as well as to all their *sudden impulses*, *illuminations*, *assurances*, and *convictions* !

Scotists and the Thomists; and still later, between the Jesuits and the Jansenists, &c. &c. on subjects of doctrine and discipline; and at all times, between the Popes and the Bishops, on points of authority and jurisdiction!

If we refer to the schisms, which arose in the Church of Rome, from the seventh century, when Popery was firmly established; to the fifteenth inclusive, not to speak of * those, which were antecedent to the former period: we shall find no less than *twenty-three* grand ones, according to † one authority; and *twenty-six* according to ‡ another; and that within the same pe-

* MOSH. ECCLES. HIST. vol. iv. p. 222—240. See also HICKES's account of *nine* principal schisms in the Church of Rome; 2nd Ed. 1706.

† See PANVINIUS's Chronicon, Ed. 1568, subjoined to Platina's History of the Lives of the Popes. In the series of Schisms and Popes cited by the Bishop of St. David's from this author, I have omitted the first *seven* Schisms which took place from the year 252, to 537 inclusive; and also the first six schismatical Popes, who flourished within the same period; as it was not before the seventh century (A. D. 602) that Phocas had conferred the title of Universal Bishop on the Pope.

‡ PETAVII Tabula Chronologica Schismatum et Antipapatum, Ed. 1724.

riod, there were no less than * *thirty-two* usurping and schismatical Popes! But should Doctor Milner overlook all these well-attested facts, can he forget the severe language of rebuke, which was indirectly addressed to himself on this very subject, by a late Roman Catholic Divine? Indeed, I may say personally addressed, because the object of Doctor O'Connor seems at all times to have been, to correct the errors and † misrepresentations of his friend the Bishop of Castabala. Has the seventy years' residence of the Popes at Avignon escaped Doctor Milner's recollection? Does he forget, too, that after a short interrup-

* PANVINIUS *ut supra*.

† "I once asked the Bishop of Castabala," says Doctor O'Connor, "how he had nerves strong enough to refer in his Winchester for the history of King Arthur to Gildas, who never, *even once*, mentions his name. He replied, Gildas **CERTAINLY** *does mention* his name. We happened to be at the time in a large and splendid library; I took down Gale's edition. He turned over leaf after leaf, but *in vain*."—COLUMBANUS *ad Hibernos*, Letter iii. p. 50.

Doctor M. having thus confounded Gildas, who speaks of the Battle of Bath, (*Mons Badonicus*) with W. of Malmesbury, the historian of the young hero Arthur's exploits; attempts in his present work, but unsuccessfully, to make his critics participate in the blunder.

tion, the papal throne was re-established there, and that a schism of *fifty years* duration ensued ; during which, the Christian world was so divided between Popes and *Anti-Popes*, that it was not possible for the most learned and pious men of the day to * determine between the two opposite lines of succession, who was the legitimate possessor of the papal chair? But, when we read, not merely of Antipopes, but *Anti-Cardinals* and *Anti-Councils*, I would ask him, whether the Roman Communion, when rent asunder by their contentions, and when the people were divided into separate churches, had been, during that period, the *centre* of Unity. On the contrary, did not this phantom of external unity, which is the principle of its consistence, as an ecclesiastical body, disappear amidst those conflicts? Did not that one schism, of which I have spoken, commonly called the *Great Western Schism*, also destroy all its pretensions to sanctity and infallibility? And have not the heresies, which it adopted at its last general Council of Trent, by removing it far from the standard of the Gospel,

* See MOSH. ECCLES. HIST. vol. iii. p. 327.

weakened, if not invalidated, its claim to the title of Apostolical ; still more, to the *exclusive* character of Apostolicity? With all these facts on record, it is most unaccountable, how he could bring himself to upbraid, not merely the Church of England, but in short, any other Church with schism.

Our Episcopal Clergy are, in general, objects of Doctor Milner's severest attack, and according as he advances in his work, he cuts at them right and left. But the Bishop of St. David's he * singles out as

* See ADDRESS to the Bishop of St. David's, prefixed to the *End of Religious Controversy*, pp. 8, 9, 10, and *Postscript* to the same, p. 202. In 1814, a pamphlet under the title of a *Political Catechism*, was published in Cork by the Rev. Mr. England, P. P. Its tendency was to exasperate the minds of *adult* Roman Catholics, (as it was far beyond the capacity of youth, for whose use it professed to be designed) against the Laws and Religion of the State, by ascribing every suffering of theirs, from the era of the Reformation to the present time, to religious persecution. To counteract the effects of that mischievous performance, the Bishop of St. David's shortly after produced his PROTESTANT'S CATECHISM on the Origin, &c. of Popery. And most completely would it have answered its end, had every mind which imbibed the poison received its corrective. To this, and other publications of this learned and indefatigable Prelate, are we to attribute the scurrility

the victim of his most inveterate rancour. When he calls him a *paradoxical* and a *burlesquing* Prelate, and sneeringly, a *modern* Prelate; ironical wit of this kind, considering the sort of warfare in which he is engaged, might pass unnoticed. But when he accuses his Lordship with being of an *acrimonious* and *malignant* spirit; with the advocacy of *persecuting* and *sanguinary* measures; and in broad terms, with “being bent on the PERSECUTION of the (Roman) Catholics.” When he can thus coolly and deliberately express himself in the face of the Legislature, at a time, that he is asking for power from the very person, whom he thus calumniates and insults; we may form a pretty fair estimate, how *conscientiously* he would use that power for the extirpation of heresy, were he once invested with it. But the grossness of his language, and the personalities to which he has descended, have only produced their natural consequence, that of a dignified forbearance on the part of his Lordship.

with which his Lordship has been treated by Doctor Milnet.—*Hinc lachrymæ!*

It will be seen, in the following pages, with what address Doctor Milner brings forward some of the ablest writers of the Church of England in controversion of their own principles. The contrivance, although novel and ingenious, has not succeeded, as I have generally demonstrated the sense of the authors to be at variance with the detached parts cited by him, a circumstance not very creditable to the candour and impartiality of which he boasts. And although, in some one or two instances, as in the case of Thorndyke and Montague, he seems to be warranted in what he says; yet their authority is not sufficient to bear down the unaltered sentiments of our Church, since the Reformation. In fact, the exception of these two but goes to establish the rule of general consent among Protestant writers on the main points. This was the opinion of Bishop Stillingfleet himself, who expressly names *Thorndyke* and *Montague*, and pointedly censures their vanity in setting up their “*singular fancies*” in opposition to the doctrine and practice of the Church of Eng-

land, which is not now to be * “ new-modelled by the caprichios of *superstitious fanatics*. . . . such as *these* ; we rather pity,” adds he, “ their weakness, than regard their censures, and are only sorry, when our adversaries make such *properties* of them, as by their means to beget in some a disaffection to our Church.” Here we find Stillingfleet, upwards of a century ago, condemning a Popish artifice, to which Doctor Milner is not above resorting at the present day, when he reproduces the rejected authorities of such men, as though they had never been so much as questioned.

Doctor Milner adds the name of JEREMY TAYLOR, Bishop of Down, to his list of Protestant divines, who palliate, if not defend, the Popish worship of images, &c.; but with what justice may be judged from the retraction of his arguments in favour of Popery, or rather in favour of the *lives* and *liberties* of its professors. For the cause of Popery itself he never advocated, as I have shewn at large in the † sequel. He

* See CONCLUSION of Bishop Stillingfleet’s Preface to his Discourse on the Idolatry of the Church of Rome.

† See CHAP. V. p. 131—134 ; and CHAP. XV. note *, p. 329.

disclaims every intention of saying, that the Popish religion is a *true* religion, and distinctly states, that he merely argued for *Toleration*, in his LIBERTY OF PROPHECY; but that every thing else which he advanced, was vain flourish, nothing but * “*wooden daggers; tinsel, and pretence; imagery, and whipt cream.*” Indeed, as if he himself had a forecast of the abuse to which his authority would be subject, he prophetically says, † “I know no reason, but it may be possible, that a WITTY MAN may *pretend*, when I am dead, that in this discourse I have *pleaded* for the doctrine of the Roman Church.” If ever the epithet *witty* applied to any person, who has made an unfair use of Bishop Taylor’s name, surely we cannot be mistaken in saying, that that person is DOCTOR MILNER.

Archbishop Wake too comes in for his share of misrepresentation. “This Prelate,” says ‡ Doctor Milner, “after all his bitter writings against the Pope and the (Roman) Catholic Church, coming to discuss the

* PREFACE to Dissuasive against Popery, second part.

† Treatise on the Real Presence, p. 261, note 28.

‡ LETTER xlv. p. 143.

terms of a proposed union between *this* Church and that of England, expressed himself willing to allow a certain superiority to the Roman Pontiffs." But this *certain* superiority, the Doctor afterwards declares to be "*a supreme authority*," which is as essential to a Christian Church as to a political state. Thus, according to him, the Archbishop *conceded* the point of Papal supremacy, so great was his desire to effect an * union between the Churches of England and Rome. Now, in the first place, the *proposed* union was not between *those* Churches, but between the former and the *Gallican* Church. And, in the next place, it was not even with the Gallican Church,

* The hopelessness of the Rev. Mr. Wix's project of a union between the Churches of England and Rome, so long as the latter continues in its unreformed state, and so widely separated from the former in *fundamentals*, is most ably proved by the Bishop of St. David's, in his LETTER of Reply to that gentleman, as well as in that, which his Lordship addressed to Lord Kenyon. The present Pope has set the question of union at rest in his instructions to his Bishops, as he says, that "*la religion Catholique, Apostolique, et Romaine, parce qu'elle est divine, est nécessairement seule, et unique, et par là NE PEUT FAIRE D'ALLIANCE AVEC AUCUNE AUTRE.*"—RELATION de ce qui s'est passé à Rome, vol. i. p. 193.

while in connexion with the Church of Rome, but with the Gallican Church, separated and independent from that Church, and *purged* from every thing which distinguished it from the Church of England. If Mosheim misconceived the object of Archbishop Wake's correspondence with the Doctors of the Sorbonne, this cannot be the case with Doctor Milner, as he must have benefitted by Maclaine's exposure of Mosheim's error. He is, therefore, convicted of a wilful misrepresentation. He quotes, it is true, part of the Primate's letter to Doctor Du Pin; but he does not quote enough of it, as in candour he was bound to do. The passage which follows, not to speak of the strong language which goes before his quotation, in rejection of the Papal Supremacy, qualifies the word, *QUALICUNQUE*, from the use of which, Doctor Milner insinuates, that the Archbishop acknowledged the Pope's *jurisdiction*, as well as his precedence. But how unfairly, the reader may judge, by referring to the Archbishop's own words, as contained in the * note.

* In a strain of eloquence worthy of the Roman orator,

A difference of opinion having arisen between two learned Prelates of our Church respecting the exposition of the words, * “thou art PETER, and upon this ROCK I will build my Church:” Doctor Milner hails it as a matter of joy, exclaiming, that † “Landaff was from remote ages a thorn in the side of Menevia,” meaning St. Da-

Archbishop Wake thus addresses the Bishops of the French Church:—“*Expergiscimini itaque viri eruditi, et quod ratio postulat, nec refragatur religio, strenuè agite Excutite tandem jugum istud, quod nec patres vestri, nec vos ferri potuistis Ex nobis promptum ac paratum exemplum; quod sequi vobis gloriosum! Quo solo irridere valeatis bruta de Vaticano fulmina.*” Then, after remarking, that though, on the dissolution of the Roman Empire, the Pope lost any privilege, which might have been conceded to him, as the Bishop of a place which was the seat of government; yet, provided they could agree about fundamentals, he was indifferent about *empty* titles “*modo in ceteris conveniatur* (then comes what Doctor Milner cites), *per me licet, suo fruatur QUALICUNQUE Primatu: non ego illi locum primum; non inanem honoris titulum invideo, &c.*” The admission of even a shadow of authority, much less of a *certain* defined one, is not implied in these words.—See THIRD APPENDIX to Mosh. Eccl. Hist. vol. vi. pp. 107—110.

* MATTH. xvi. 18.

† ADDRESS ut supr. p. xiv.; the translation of Bishop Marsh to the See of Peterborough, has put an end to this fanciful coincidence.

vid's. But, whether we determine with * Bishop Marsh, on the one hand, that the word ROCK refers to *St. Peter*, and that our Saviour *argued* from the name to the *meaning* of the name ; i. e. from *Cepha* or ΠΕΤΡΟΣ, to what corresponded with the *office* of the Apostle ; or with the *substantial* services, which our Lord foresaw he would render the Church ; and that we thus *identify* the *faith* with the *person* of the Apostle, because his faith operated through his person : or, whether we coincide, on the other hand, with the † Bishop of St. David's, that the ROCK alludes to *Christ*, and to the confession, not of St. Peter individually, but of the other Apostles united with him ; that is, to their *doctrine*—the Messiahship of Jesus, on which, as on a foundation, the Christian Church is built ; and that we *cannot* argue from the name to the meaning of the name. I say, in whatever light we view their opinions, resulting as they do from the deepest philological research, and

* APPENDIX to Comp. View of the Churches of England and Rome, pp. 273—286.

† TRACTS on the Origin and Independence of the ancient British Church, &c. pp. 10—21.

to whichsoever side we attach ourselves, we can discern no accession of strength to Doctor Milner's cause; for both agree, that PETRUS has a relative signification, as they also agree, that the * Supremacy of the Pope is discountenanced as well by the Scriptures, as the primitive History of the Church.

† Doctor Milner having complained that Protestant writers are in the habit of applying the term *Papist*, in the offensive sense, and having in his present work intimated his wish on this head; I have throughout these pages, cautiously abstained from

* Doctor Milner imagined, that the argument for Papal Supremacy was strengthened in consequence of Bishop Marsh having asserted, that the words in Matt. xvi. 18, have the same import, as if we said in English to a person, whose name was Rock; "Thou art Rock in *name*, and shalt be Rock in *deed*; for on thee," &c.: and because his Lordship illustrated the Syriac words used by our Saviour by the French translation, "*Tu es Pierre, et sur cette Pierre, &c.*;" the corresponding *Cepha* and *Pierre* being both a proper name, and an appellative in their respective languages. But how vain is the conjecture? For if the mere circumstance of St. Peter's presiding over the Church of Rome (granting that he did so) entitled it to Supremacy; it would follow, that *every other Church* over which he or St. Paul presided, would be *likewise* entitled to Supremacy.

† LETTERS to a Prebendary, p. 3.

the use of it. Not that I consider it in its appropriate meaning as more than designating a sectary; namely, a person devoted to the Pope: just as the adjuncts, *Lutheran*, *Calvinist* and *Arian*, point out the particular sect, to which individuals respectively belong. To the term *Papist*, strictly speaking, Doctor Milner should not object, having its root in *Papa*, and because both it and the word *Romanist* were used, as may be seen in Bishop Jewell's works, long before pains and penalties were enacted against the members of the Church of Rome. This very circumstance sets aside his charge, * "that these terms were invented in the time of persecution, to serve as a cloak for the exercise of it." Indeed, were Protestant writers to use the term *Popist*, there might be some ground for objecting to it as an offensive term; since, like its correlatives, *Pope* and *Popery*, it might be said to spring from † *POPA*, a word descriptive of a person every way contemptible and mean.

* *IBID.*

† *POPA* signified one of the lowest and most degraded class. "*Popa, nescio quis de circo maximo.*"—*CIC. pro Milone*, Sect. 24. On this passage the Annotator Asco-

But while Doctor Milner is thus particular on the score of epithets as applied to those of his own Communion ; he seems to feel perfect indifference, to say the least of it, about those, which he applies to the members of the Established Church. He tauntingly calls them Anglicans, Church-of-England men, *Protestant* Christians, &c.; and frequently brands them with the odious names of *heretics*, and *schismatics*. Notwithstanding this, in the following pages, I shall not be tempted, in imitation of him, to depart from that line of moderation and civility, which I prescribed to myself from the outset, and which I deem perfectly compatible with the interests of truth.

The term *Catholic*, as exclusively applied to members of the Church of Rome, I do

nius observes, “ *Papa est sacrorum administer, qui victimas immolat.*” The Rev. MR. ROBERTS shrewdly conjectures, that the title of Pope was probably given by the Gentiles, when the *Mass* came to be represented as a *sacrifice*; but that the Pope disliking it, substituted *Papa*, Father, in opposition to our Lord’s injunction to his disciples—“call no man *your Father* upon earth, for one is YOUR FATHER, which is in heaven.”—Matt. xxiii. 9. See Mr. ROBERTS’s Review of Popery, p. 81, and CRITO’s Letter to Mr. Gandolphy, Protestant Adv. Sept. 1815, p. 542.

not use, for the very reason, on account of which it is adopted by Doctor Milner; as it would be assuming, that they *were*, and that we *were not*, true members of the Church of Christ. There is no doubt, that the * early Christians were unwilling to grant the appellation of *Catholic* to the heretics of their time. But will he, therefore, pretend to say, that the members of the Church of Rome, to whom alone he gives this appellation, hold that *pure* and *unadulterate* faith demanding *universal* credit and belief, which those early Christians did: or, that we of the Church of England resemble those heretics in *disclaiming* all dependance on Christ and God? If he cannot, then the inference is plain. † “Of what Church are you,” said *Polemo*, his judge, to an ancient martyr. *Pionius* replied, “I am of the *Catholic* Church, for Christ has *no other*.” When I myself aver the same thing, and in jus-

* Some excellent observations on the scrupulousness of the primitive Christians in this respect, are given by the Rev. Dr. Nares in his elaborate Discourses on THE THREE CREEDS. See particularly Sermon 1, p. 12, Ed. 1819.

† Cujus, inquit Polemo, es Ecclesiæ? Respondit Pionius, *Catholicæ: nulla enim est alia apud Christum.*—ACT. Pionii apud Baron. an. 254.

tice, concede to Doctor Milner the privilege of Catholicity, I must necessarily protest against his arrogant assumption of a term, to which, in his use of it, *exclusiveness* is attached.

Should I appear either too minute, or too diffuse in my references to the ancient fathers, this must be my apology; that it arises from the numerous and varied citations produced by Doctor Milner. I was determined to deprive him of the adventitious aid, which he derived from this source, and therefore, I have attentively explored it through all its branches. By these means, the reader, who has neither time, nor inclination to consult the originals, will have the opportunity of judging with accuracy and satisfaction, what violence is done to the early writers in being pressed into the service of Popery.

With respect to both ancient and modern authors, I may say, that as I considered it indispensable to quote their own words, so I have pointed to the original with the most scrupulous exactness, and have neither left my reader in doubt or displeasure at unauthenticated assertions. I have done

so, both because they express their own thoughts better than I could possibly do, and because it enabled me to direct the reader's attention to places, whence he might derive further information on the subject under discussion. In general, I can conscientiously declare, that TRUTH has been my sole object, and that, for the attainment of this honest and honourable end, I have only had recourse to corresponding means. I have stated nothing as a fact, but what I believed, and almost uniformly proved, to be one; nor have I deduced a single inference, which I was not persuaded to have fairly resulted from the premises.

I have, as I conceive, noticed all Doctor Milner's principal arguments, and have distinctly placed them and my answers together under the reader's view; so that he can at once decide on the merits of the case. And if I have, in any instance, drawn a false conclusion, or have been inadvertently betrayed into a warmth of expression, I furnish a corrective; as I, at the same moment, exhibit the grounds on which I build my argument, or throw out an imputation.

And, however some persons may think, that the single objection to Popery, arising from its *idolatry*, is in ONE WORD an Answer to the whole of Doctor Milner's *End of Religious Controversy*, every other superstition being either included in it, or of minor consideration; yet the necessity of still continuing to refute that, which in defiance to refutation, is with confidence upheld, appeared to me absolutely indispensable. Arguments, however weak, should be answered, and calumnies, however groundless, should be exposed; lest, in the opinions of ignorant and superficial observers, weakness should be mistaken for strength, and wicked and false assertions should be admitted as truths, because not disputed.

I have, in the last place, to observe, that it is an incontrovertible proof of the soundness of our cause, that the arguments of our ablest Divines can bear to be brought forward again and again in opposition to the exploded objections of Popery; as often as the temerity of our adversaries call for their reproduction. Of those adversaries themselves, I can only say, that they manifest no symptoms of that infallible prin-

ciple, which they claim for the Church, to which they belong. Levity, fallacy, and folly, minutely characterize them, and, while they seem to forget the humiliating defeats, which Popery, in all its forms, has sustained since the era of the Reformation, they daily appear to court fresh disaster and multiplied disgrace. In a word, while the champions of our Church have, from the time of Jewell to the present day, been uniformly triumphant, their opponents only live in the praises of such men as Gregory Martin, Thomas Ward, and

THE REVEREND DOCTOR MILNER.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
<i>The Scripture Canon of the Church of England vindicated</i>	<i>1</i>

CHAPTER II.

<i>The variance of the XIVth Psalm, as it stands in our Authorized Translation of the Bible and Book of Common Prayer, accounted for.....</i>	<i>34</i>
---	-----------

CHAPTER III.

<i>The genuineness of the Text of the three heavenly Witnesses inquired into</i>	<i>42</i>
--	-----------

CHAPTER IV.

<i>Our Authorized Translation of the Bible vindicated ..</i>	<i>60</i>
--	-----------

CHAPTER V.

<i>The Doctrine of Transubstantiation, a Papal Novelty.</i>	<i>109</i>
---	------------

CHAPTER VI.

<i>The Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament</i>	<i>139</i>
---	------------

CHAPTER VII.

<i>The Suppression of half the Eucharist, sacrilegious ..</i>	<i>189</i>
---	------------

CHAPTER VIII.

<i>The Sacrifice of the Mass, impious</i>	<i>239</i>
---	------------

CHAPTER IX.

<i>Absolution from Sin.....</i>	<i>245</i>
---------------------------------	------------

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHAPTER X.	
<i>Indulgences</i>	265
CHAPTER XI.	
<i>Purgatory</i>	277
CHAPTER XII.	
<i>Extreme Unction</i>	294
CHAPTER XIII.	
<i>The Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images, blasphemous and idolatrous</i>	298
CHAPTER XIV.	
<i>Antichrist</i>	317
CHAPTER XV.	
<i>The Supremacy of the Pope</i>	326
CHAPTER XVI.	
<i>Toleration</i>	351
CHAPTER XVII.	
<i>Popish, or false Miracles</i>	361
CHAPTER XVIII.	
<i>Prayers in an unknown Tongue</i>	381
CHAPTER XIX.	
<i>Prohibition of the Scriptures</i>	391
CHAPTER XX.	
<i>The Celibacy of the Clergy</i>	400
CHAPTER XXI.	
<i>Exclusive Catholicity</i>	407

SCRIPTURE CANON,

&c.

CHAPTER I.

THE SCRIPTURE CANON OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND VINDICATED.

PREPARATORY to the charge which Doctor Milner makes on our received English version of the Scriptures, he passes some remarks on * “the vain confidence of the Protestant,” who adheres to the Bible alone, as his rule of faith, and who disregards the two-fold rule or law, by which the † (Roman) Catholic Church is guided, and of which it is constituted an interpreter or judge. “Supposing then,” says he,

* END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY, Letter IX. p. 67.

† When Doctor Milner makes mention of the *Catholic Church*, he is to be understood as speaking of the *Church of Rome*. But to guard against mistake, the term *Roman* is generally prefixed to it in a parenthesis, where his own words are cited.

addressing himself to his correspondent, “ you to be the Protestant I have been speaking of, I ask you, how you have learnt what is the Canon of Scripture; that is to say, which are the books that have been written by divine inspiration; or, indeed, how have you ascertained that any books at all have been so written?”

I shall then, for a moment, put myself in the place of his correspondent, and reply, that I need not refer to a living, speaking authority, such as that which exists in the Church of Rome, to tell me in what the Canon of Scripture consists. * Our SAVIOUR said, that the *law*, and the *prophets*, and the *Psalms*, testified of Him; and his words are true. Thus, then, the Scriptures themselves, the *written word*, tell me where the Canon of Scripture is to be found. Those I believe, while I reject *tradition*, which Doctor Milner receives with sentiments of † equal piety and reverence; nay, as possessing even superior authority to the Scriptures themselves. Let me, however, be here understood as drawing a distinction between tradition as a rule of faith, and all other kinds of it; and that when I say generally I reject tradition—the *unwritten word*, the *tota doctrina non scripta*—it

* LUKE, xxiv. 44.

† Tridentina Synodus - - - - - *pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ* suscipit et veneratur. SESS. IV. p. 11. Ed. Soteal. 1351.

does not follow, that I reject that *species of it which proves the genuineness of the New Testament. This is tradition of *testimony*, and is no way whatever connected with tradition of *doctrine*; but is applied to the *written word*. So that, when we speak of tradition of *testimony*, tradition of *ceremonies*, and tradition of *interpretation*, we must take care not to confound any of them with that sort of tradition which is to the Church of Rome a RULE OF FAITH, and which is exclusively applicable to the *unwritten word*. Indeed, if this distinction be not observed, as any thing whatever delivered from one person to another may be called *tradition*, endless confusion must be the consequence.

I say then, that on the Scriptures themselves,

* According to BELLARMINE, there are *three* kinds of Tradition. The first is DIVINE tradition, relating to doctrines delivered by Christ to his apostles; and though taught by them, left *unrecorded*. The *second* is APOSTOLICAL tradition, relating to doctrines also taught by the apostles, and also left *unrecorded*; yet as they have been dictated by the Holy Spirit, they also have received the epithet DIVINE. These two kinds constitute with Bellarmine the *unwritten word* of God, and are always comprehended in the term *tradition*. The *third* kind, which he mentions, is of human origin, and relates to church *ceremonies*, &c.; this is called tradition of the church, or ECCLESIASTICAL tradition. See BISHOP MARSH'S Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome, pp. 6—8.

the certainty respecting the Canon of the Old Testament is founded; for the Scriptures, which Christ sanctioned are the very ones which are now contained in the Hebrew Bible, and which, in the Old Testament constitute the CANON of the Church of England; while the CANON of the Old Testament adopted by the Church of Rome, received neither the sanction of Christ nor of his apostles. What those books are, as well as their exact number, is certified, in the first place, by Josephus, himself too a Jewish Priest, and likewise contemporary with * some of the apostles; next, by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in the second century; and lastly, by Jerome, in the fourth century.

The first of these writers says, † “we have not thousands of books, discordant and contradicting each other, but we have only *twenty-two*; which comprehend the history of all former ages, and are justly regarded as divine.” The Jewish historian then proceeds to divide the entire number into *three* classes, and to give a detail of the subjects treated of in each class—the LAW occupying the *first*; the PROPHETS, the *second*; and the HAGIOGRAPHΑ, the

* SS. PAUL, PETER, and JOHN.

† Ου μυριαδες ουν εισι βιβλιων παρ' ἡμιν ασυμφωνων και μαχομενων ΔΥΟ ΔΕ ΜΟΝΑ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΙΣ ΕΙΚΟΣΙ ΒΙΒΛΙΑ, τε παντος εχοντα χρονε την αναγραφην τα δικαιως θεια πεπιστευμενα.

third *class*. In this last class, the **PSALMS** occupy the *first* place. Melito only differs from Josephus in his omission of the Book of Esther, which is an oversight, as it is not found in Origen's catalogue. And Jerome agrees with Josephus, not only as to the three-fold division, but as to the books themselves, and the number of them; holding in common with him the books of the **LAW** to be five, but * varying from him as to the point, which divides the remaining seventeen into the second and third classes. The coincidence between the number of the books of which the Canon of the Old Testament consists, and the number of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet, viz. *twenty-two*, although probably designed, was regarded by † Jerome as something mysterious. From this it appears, that the Church of England has adopted in its Canon of the Old Testament precisely the *same* Books, which the *Hebrew* Bible contained, when Jerome translated it; and that its

* Thus Josephus and Jerome agreed about the number of the books of which the first class consisted; but differed in this manner respecting the others.

Josephus's second class } consisted of	13 books.	Jerome's second class } consisted of	8 books.
— third ditto ..	4	— third ditto ..	9
	<hr/> 17		<hr/> 17

† *Viginti duo volumina supputantur, quibus, quasi literis, exordiis in Dei doctrinâ, tenera adhuc et lactens viri justi eruditur infantia.* JEROME, Prologus galeatus.

Canon is the *identical* one which was sanctioned by our Saviour.

How differently circumstanced is Doctor Milner's *infallible* church, which possesses a Canon, that neither Christ nor his Apostles authorized. It is true, they say, it was handed down by apostolical tradition ; but it is as true, that this *living, speaking* authority, by which the Word of God itself is reduced to a state of tutelage and subserviency, was guilty of an egregious error in the very outset, in determining its Canon from an * interpolated Greek copy of the Bible, and making it to consist not only of those books, which the Church of England retains as being referred to by Christ ; but of others, which not only were not alluded to by Him, but which the concurrent voice of antiquity rejects, for the *very reason* of their not being *alluded to* by Him, as apocryphal. It is well known, that the council of Trent has ratified this corrupt Canon, and that it has attached equal reverence and esteem to the books of which it is composed indiscriminately. By doing so, however, it was well aware that it upheld such

* “ They were not out of the Hebrew fountain (we speak of the Latin Translations of the Old Testament), but out of the Greek stream ; therefore the Greek being not altogether clear, the Latin derived from it must needs be muddy.”
PREFACE OF EPISTLE to the reader by the translators of our Bible, in 1611.

of the corruptions of Popery, as derived-countenance and support from the apocryphal books.

The difference between the Canons of the two Churches marks the difference between the sources whence they are derived. We know that the Septuagint version of the Scriptures was made at the instance of Ptolemy Philadelphus, nearly 300 years before the birth of Christ; and that the books which that version contained in addition to the writings of the Hebrew Bible, were written at a period not more remote than two centuries before that event. To the Greek Jews resident in Egypt may be ascribed the insertion of those additional books among their Scriptures; yet without their having acknowledged them to be canonical. This appears to be the case from the testimony of Philo, an Egyptian Jew of the first century. Unable to discriminate between the books which were of Hebrew, and those of Greek origin, the author or authors of the * Latin version translated all the books of the Septuagint without distinction into Latin; and without distinction all were pronounced by St.

* The most noted of the earliest Latin versions is that called the *old Italic*. Of this version there are three varieties, the oldest of which is represented as being most beautiful, being written *on purple vellum, in silver characters*, and preserved at Brescia in Italy. See NOLAN's Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, pp. 59, 60.

Augustine as of *canonical* authority. *Such* is the source from which the Church of Rome derives its CANON of the Old Testament.

On the other hand, we find, that Jerome, although he attempted at the request of Pope Damasus to revise the discordant Latin versions, which existed in his time, from the Septuagint; yet he relinquished this attempt, and formed a new Latin version of the Old Testament early in the fifth century; not like the other Latin versions derived from the Septuagint, but from the Hebrew, the original inspired text. This he was enabled to do, as he did not confine his reading, like * Augustine, to works in his native language, being intimately versed both in Greek and Hebrew. But such books as were not in the Hebrew Bible, he marked down as *apocryphal*. *This* is the source from which the Church of England derives *its* CANON of the Scriptures; and such is the view taken by our ablest divines of the Canons of the respective churches. The

* “Augustine wished to dissuade Jerome from translating the Scriptures of the Old Testament out of the Hebrew Tongue; whose reasons, as they are but frivolous, are derided by Jerome, who being learned in the Hebrew and Chaldee tongues, refused to be taught by Augustine, that was *ignorant* in them, what was to be done in translations out of them.” FULKE’S DEFENSE of the sincere and true Translations of the Holie Scriptures, p. 22. Ed. 1583.

reader may now judge whether the Church of Rome be warranted, as Doctor Milner contends, in rejecting Jerome's Canon ; in attempting to degrade that which was the only Canon of our Saviour Jesus Christ, by calling it the Canon of the * *Scribes and Pharisees*; and finally, in ratifying Augustine's corrupt Canon.

To pronounce with confidence what books of the Canon, or parts of books, are inspired, and what not, may consistently belong to Doctor Milner, as being a member of a church which lays claim to infallibility ; but certainly not to a member of the Church of England. So that, when he asks, how *we* have learned what books " have been written by divine inspiration," or how we have ascertained that any books at all have been so written? we may answer, that where the Holy Scriptures declare, that they set forth a divine Revelation, or that they express the word of God, we believe them to do so. But as to the fact of their *inspiration*, we must with awe and humility decline to say, what we believe *no* church, ancient or modern, can ever attest. In respect to the use of Scripture, wherever we conceive our authorized English version to be inaccurate, and what human production can claim per-

* See Bishop Chaloner's *note*, prefixed to the First Book of Maccabees.

fect exemption from error, we are at liberty to appeal to the original? In this point, we differ from the practice of the Church of Rome, which ascribes to the Latin vulgate, its authorized translation, even higher authority than it does to the inspired originals themselves; and in its last general council directs, * “that it shall be esteemed authentic, and that no person, under any pretence whatever, shall presume to reject it.” Doctor Milner knows too, that we do not, like the Church of Rome, affect to expound the Scriptures under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and that we are satisfied to interpret them by the aid of reason and learning.

But here Doctor Milner urges, that HOOKER, “our great authority,” shews, that Scripture cannot bear testimony to itself. Hooker’s opinion would certainly carry great weight with it in deciding any point, but on the present one he is silent; for in the place to which Doctor Milner refers, he discusses a different branch of the subject: *viz.* by what authority the Canon of Scripture is determined. But were he to have thus expressed himself, his opinion would be far outweighed by that of the most

* Ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio - - - - - pro authenticâ habeatur, ut nemo illam rejicere *quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat.*—Concil. Trid. Sess. iv. p. 14.

enlightened divines of the Church of England, who have declared with one voice, that the *inspiration of Scripture is not cognizable by *human* observation; that it is what human evidence *cannot* attest; that it cannot be determined except by *divine* testimony, and therefore, only by Scripture itself.

† Doctor Milner next says, that we have *no* authority for receiving the Gospels of SS. Mark and Luke, who were not apostles, as canonical, and rejecting an authentic work of great excellence, the Epistle of St. Barnabas, who is termed in Scripture an apostle. In a word, that we have *no* authority for asserting, that the sacred volumes are the genuine composition of the holy persons, whose names they bear, “except *tradition, and the living voice of the church.*”

I need not here remind Doctor Milner, that the rejection of tradition as a rule of faith constituted the vital principle of the Reformation, and that although we receive as canonical the Gospels of SS. Mark and Luke, as we do ancient interpretations of them, by what in a certain sense may be called tradition; yet we do so at *our own* discretion. So that, when he insinuates, that the Churches of England and

* See particularly COMP. VIEW, p. 147.

† LETTER IX. p. 68.

Rome agree about tradition, it must be observed, that the word is used by him in a sense *different* from that in which *we* understand it. Tradition, in this general sense, as it applies to the *unwritten* word, will not prove that the sacred writings are the genuine productions of those, whose names they bear. A proof of this kind, must be established by a different sort of tradition—the tradition of *testimony*. This latter kind, therefore, which applies to the *written word*, should, as I have already observed, not be confounded with tradition as a rule of faith, and which applies exclusively to the *unwritten word*. To shew how well this distinction is preserved by our church, as *a WITNESS AND KEEPER OF HOLY WRIT, let the very Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, which Doctor Milner speaks of, be those, the genuineness of which, we are about to establish. The process to be observed is similar to that, which would be used in determining the genuineness of any profane work, such as that of Virgil, or of Horace; since it makes no difference so far as the discovery of the author is concerned, that the former are *inspired* writings, the latter, not. Thus, we have passages from those Gospels in ecclesiastical writers, as may be seen in a *Catena Patrum* and in *Pole's Synopsis*, from the present

* ARTICLE XX.

time, nearly to that in which those Gospels were written, when the authors of them must have been known. This certainly is tradition; because the evidence is * conveyed down to us from the earliest ages; but it is a tradition of *testimony*, and is no way connected with tradition of *doctrine*.

With respect to St. Barnabas's Epistle, which Doctor Milner pronounces to be an authentic work of great excellence, there were not the same grounds for receiving it into the CANON of the Church of England, as for receiving the Gospels just spoken of, and therefore the framers of that Canon wisely rejected it. For, in the first place, doubt and uncertainty affect the testimonies of the different writers, who have made quotations from the Epistle of this father. In the next place, it is not found in any of the ancient Canons. And lastly, it was not acknowledged as Scripture by any very early writer. But, for the purpose of coming to the point, I shall meet Doctor Milner on ground of his own choosing. He first refers to Cotelierius, as furnishing evidence that the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas is "authentic," (*genuine*, I suppose he means) and next, to Grabe's SPICILEGIUM.

I am willing to admit, that Doctor Milner

* See BISHOP BURNET's Expos. of the *Sixth* Article, p. 72.

has, in the present instance, forgot, that the Council of Trent has, in its *fourth* Session, enumerated in its Canon of the New Testament, the very books which we adopt in ours. But that he should quote *Cotelerius*, as affording evidence of Barnabas being the author of the Epistle ascribed to him, is not a little surprising. For, in that author's *SYLLABUS of Letters, which relate to the Apostolic Fathers, the first is that of †Archbishop Laud to Menard, in which he says, I grant that Barnabas's Epistle is sufficiently ancient, but *not canonical*. Next, ‡Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, observes:—"moreover, let that Epistle, which is reported to belong to Barnabas, be ranked among the *spurious* books of the New Testament." § Ruffinus too enumerates it among those productions, about which there is *the greatest doubt*. || Clemens Alexandrinus speaks of it as being among those writings, to which *objections* are made. He specifies those *objectionable* writings to be the Epistles of Clemens

* COTELER., p. 4.

† Barnabæ Epistolam satis antiquam agnosco, *non canonicam*.

‡ Εν τοις ΝΟΘΟΙΣ κατατιταχθω και των Παυλε πραξιων η γραφη και η φερομενη Βαρναβα επισολη.

§ De quibus *quam maxime dubitatur*.

|| Αντιλιγομενων γραφων της τε ΒΑΡΝΑΒΑ, και Κλημεντος, και Ιεδα. Lib. vi. c. 13.

Romanus, *Barnabas*, and Jude. * He again says, that he does not omit in his account of the Scriptures those books about which there is any doubt, and expressly names the *Epistle of St. Barnabas* as one of them. This father's testimony, as far as it goes, it is true, leads to the rejection of the Epistle of Jude, which we deem canonical. Doctor Milner seems to have this circumstance in view, when he proclaims the uncertainty of the Church of England, about the formation of its Canon, and its want of authority to determine what books are genuine, and what not. But his observation, if it have any force, applies equally to the Church of Rome. Thus, † says he, “ numerous apocryphal prophecies, and spurious Gospels and Epistles, under the same or equally venerable names, were circulated in the Church, during its early ages, and accredited by different learned writers, and holy fathers; while some of the *really* canonical books, were rejected or doubted by them.” All this is true, and the present is a case in point, where the evidence of Clemens Alexandrinus impeaches the genuineness of the Epistle ascribed to Jude. However, to rescue this particular Epistle from the imputation cast on it by this father, we must pre-

* Μη δε τας αντιλεγόμενας παρελθων την τε ΒΑΡΝΑΒΑ.

† LETTER ix. p. 68.

serve the course employed in establishing the spuriousness of the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas. When there are conflicting testimonies; the number, credibility, and skill of the witnesses on both sides, must be taken into account, and the matter be decided as those preponderate, for or against. To this process alone, had our reformers recourse, when they settled our Canon, without requiring the aid of a *living, speaking* authority, to guide them in the selection of the books of which it consisted.

It should be remarked too, that * Jerome, in his catalogue of Greek writings, sets down Barnabas's Epistle as among the apocryphal Scriptures. And Cotelierus's own argument, after combatting the opinion of Bede, about the time at which Barnabas entered on his discipleship, is of an hypothetical nature, beginning with a *certè vix credi potest*. He says, that on the score of authority, there is a difference between the Epistles of Clemens and Barnabas; † for, that the Epistle of the former obtained *greater celebrity*. ‡ Cotelierus likewise adds,

* COTELER. Monumen. Græc. Eccl. p. 5.

† Cujus Epistola *tantum famæ* non est consecuta, ac illa Clementis. IBID.

‡ Eam saltem a multis Catholicis admissam - - - ex quibus omnibus conficitur, non admodum clarum utrum præsentem Epistolam adjudicare debemus Barnabæ Apostolo, an *alteri* homini apostolico, qui aut Barnabæ nomen assumpsit, &c. &c. IBID.

that it has been received, at least by many (Roman) Catholics; and concludes with observing, that “*it is not* very evident, whether we ought to ascribe the present Epistle to Barnabas, the apostle, or to *some* apostolic person who assumed his name.” It certainly is not surprising, that so ancient a fragment, whether genuine or not, should be held in high estimation by Cotelierius; the surprise rather is, that Doctor Milner could quote this Doctor of the Sorbonne as doing, what in fact, he does not,—namely, give the least evidence towards establishing the genuineness of Barnabas’s Epistle.

It appears from what *Lardner says on the subject, that Barnabas’s Epistle was not reckoned a book of authority, or part of the rule of faith, by those ancient Christians, who have taken the greatest notice of it; as Clemens Alex., Origen, or Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History. Nor is it ranked as such, by those who have given catalogues of the books of the New Testament; as Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Jerome, Ruffinus, and Augustine. It also appears, that Barnabas was not one of Christ’s twelve apostles, and that he was not

* See BISHOP WATSON’s Collection of Tracts, vol. ii. p. 14, for Lardner’s History of the Apostles and Evangelists.

chosen one instead of Judas ; for, if he were, St. Paul would have said *us* in the * Epistle, which he addressed to the Galatians, where he twice uses the word *me*. † Mosheim, on the authority of Tillemont and Ittigius, accounts for the Epistle in question being the production of some Jew of the second century, from the superstitious attachment which it shews to Jewish fables. On the whole, therefore, it appears, that the Church of England is warranted in the decision it has come to respecting the reputed Epistle of Barnabas ; and that it has been guided, as it should be, by that kind of tradition which we call *tradition of testimony* ; but by no means, by tradition in the popish sense, as Doctor Milner would lead his readers to suppose was the case. As to ‡ GRABE, the second writer referred to by Doctor Milner, he only gives fragments of the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas ; while in his Index, he inserts the saint himself as one of the *apostolical fathers*. No farther does his testimony extend.

It is not by popish authorities alone, that Doctor Milner supports his arguments ; he has enlisted under his banner a still greater number of Protestant writers. If this be a novel course for a popish polemic to take, it certainly is not

* ii. 9

† Eccl. Hist. vol. i. p. 113.

‡ See SPICILEGIUM.

an unwise one, being designed as the means of confirming the bigotry of his Roman Catholic readers, who will receive at his hands his portraiture of heresy, with as much reverence as they receive the Gospel itself, on the supposition that he convicts his adversaries by their own testimony. To disabuse such persons, I have principally directed my research to those Protestant works on which Doctor Milner has laid so much stress; and as often as I could discover the passages to which he refers, I have been almost uniformly successful, as these pages will shew, in detecting error, or misrepresentation. I say, as often as I could discover, since his references, whether from accident or design, are seldom correct.

* Doctor Milner proceeds to say, “that the genuine Canon of Scripture was fixed in the fourth century by the tradition and authority of the church, declared in the third Council of Carthage, and by a decretal of Pope Innocent the First; and that it is so clear, that the Canon is built on the tradition of the church, that most learned Protestants, with Luther himself, have been forced to acknowledge it in terms as strong as those in the well-known declaration of St. Augustine.”

In the first place, the assumption with respect

* LETTER ix. p. 68.

to Luther is quite gratuitous; for as to his confessions, retractations, or inconsistencies, with which Doctor Milner constantly taunts the Church of England, they go for nothing. What have the errors of Luther, or of this *apostate monk*, as he calls him, to do with the question at issue? If, in the body of his doctrine, defects can be discovered, we know that the greatest lights of the church, and in the purest times of it, were not agreed in all their opinions; and if, in his character, failings are discernible, we equally know, that an apostle himself was not free from reproach. But were they as glaring as Doctor Milner represents them to be, they were counterbalanced by great virtues and high endowments of mind, which appeared as constellations in the dark expanse which surrounded them. The wonder, then, should be, not that he had imperfections; but that he had so few. To expect that Luther should not be tossed about by the tempest which agitated Europe in his time, and which he himself may, in a manner, be said to have created, would be to suppose him more than mortal.

Doctor Milner confronts us with the testimony of the judicious HOOKER, another of those learned Protestants, who, he says, are compelled to acknowledge, that the Canon of Scripture is built on the tradition of the church. What this acknowledgment is, we shall pre-

sently see. * Hooker argues thus. After observing, that it is by some *childishly* demanded, what Scripture can teach the authority of Scripture, he goes on to say, that certainly it is not a self-evident proposition, that the Scriptures are the oracles of God; for then, that every person who heard them would as readily assent to them, as to the axiom, that the whole is greater than a part. Therefore, that some knowledge must be presupposed, by which we know them to be divine. “So that the thing to be ascertained is, whence comes our instruction? *Some* answer from tradition; (observe he does not expressly give this as his own answer). Is this enough?” He then adds, that we should not reject the lessons of *experience*, as by it we know, “that the first outward notice, which leads men to esteem the Scriptures is the authority of God’s church. For, when we know, that the *whole* Church of God has that opinion of the Scriptures, we judge it, even at the first, an impudent thing for any man bred and brought up in the church, to be of a contrary mind without cause.” What is this but the language of some of our ablest commentators, whose opinions confirm the right of private judgment, while they recommend a distrust in our own understanding, and a respectful defer-

* ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY, book iii. sect. viii. p. 77,

ence to the judgment of our superiors—the governing members of the church, when we think differently from them in any particular point. This surely is not ascribing to the church that infallible authority, with which Doctor Milner invests the Church of Rome.

But to proceed with Hooker. * “If,” says he, “I believe the Gospel, *reason* is of singular use in confirming my belief. Again; exclude the use of natural reason, about the sense of the Holy Scriptures, concerning the articles of our faith, and then, *who* can assure us that the Scriptures doth concern the articles of our faith? Can christian men perform what Peter requires, and be able, *without the use of reason*, to render a reason sound and sufficient, to answer them that demand it. And for that cause, it is not said amiss, touching ecclesiastical canons, that *by instinct of the Holy Ghost, they have been made and received by the reverend acceptance of the world.*” It may be seen from this, that Hooker ascribes a due reverence to the church, and argues, that it should not be withheld from it without sufficient cause. But he is far from laying down any such position as that attributed to him by Doctor Milner; or acknowledging that the Canon of Scripture is built on the tradition of the church. On the

* ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY, book iii. sect. viii. p. 77.

contrary, he dwells too largely on the use of reason, to admit of such a conclusion ; for reason must be discarded, if the authority of the church, in the popish sense, be admitted.

How stands the case with respect to LARDNER, whom Doctor Milner puts down as agreeing with Hooker, and consequently with himself, respecting the foundation on which the Canon of Scripture is built? We find his evidence very full on this subject, and to the following effect :—* “ That the number of the books to be received as *canonical*, *had not been determined by the authority of any council*, as appears from the different judgments among Christians concerning divers books ; particularly the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Revelations, which some received as canonical, others not.” Is this a forced acknowledgment in favour of Doctor Milner’s argument? On the contrary, the testimony, as far as it goes, refutes it ; while it calls his candour in question. But further ; the Doctor contends, that the Canon was finally fixed, by the tradition and authority of the church, declared in the third Council of Carthage : while † Lardner, to whom he appeals, says “ that the third Council of Carthage only ordains, that nothing but canonical Scripture be

* See BISHOP WATSON’S Collection of Tracts, vol. ii. p. 20.

† *IBID.*

read in the church, under the name of divine Scripture.” But the council does not pronounce, what books were canonical, and what not; although it appears that *some* were considered canonical at that time. Lardner further states, that the Council of Laodicea, which preceded that of Carthage, held the same language. But he has only stated, what every ecclesiastical historian, before his time, has done—namely, that the books, of which the Canon consists, were known to be the genuine writings of the apostles and evangelists, as we know the works of Cæsar and Cicero; and that in *all* ages, christian people and churches had a liberty to judge according to evidence. Lardner then draws his observations on the subject to a close, after decidedly rejecting tradition in the sense attached to it by Doctor Milner; no less than the authority of the church itself, as the basis of the Canon. * “In fine,” says he, “the writings of the apostles and the evangelists are received, as the works of other eminent men of antiquity, *upon the ground of general consent and testimony.*” Does this language express any thing like a forced acknowledgment respecting the basis on which the Canon rests; an acknowledgment, which Doctor Milner affirms, has been made on the part of the most learned Protest-

* IBIDEM.

ants, in terms equally significant with those in the celebrated declaration of *St. Augustine, who would not believe the Gospel itself, if the authority of the Catholic church did not oblige him to do so? Does it not rather point out the criterions by which the genuineness of the inspired originals may be ascertained, and the sufficiency of reason and learning in the application of those criterions?

The observations of the great SELDEN, as having the same bearing with those of Lardner, richly deserve our attention. †“It is,” says this writer, “a great question, how we know Scripture to be Scripture, whether by the church or man’s private spirit. Let me ask, how I know any thing? How I know this carpet to be green? First because somebody told me it was green: that you call the church in *your way*. Thus after I have been told it is green, when I see the colour again, I know it to be green, my own eyes tell me it is green: that you call the *private spirit*.” Here the senses give evidence to the truth of previous information respecting a particular colour, and may be considered analogous to reason and learning, by the aid of which, the testimony

* Ego Evangelio non crederem, nisi me commoveret Ecclesiæ auctoritas.—EPIST. contra Fundam.

† TABLE TALK, p. 2010.

handed down to us, that is, the tradition of *testimony*, can be rendered serviceable in determining what Scripture is canonical and what not, contrary to the dogma of the popish church.

But, * Doctor Milner contends, that, as we admit “that the *unwritten word* was the first rule of Christianity, it is incumbent on us to demonstrate, and this by no less an authority than that which established the rule, *at what precise period it was abrogated.*” It is true, that the doctrines which Christ taught during his ministry were *traditional*, and that those, which his apostles subsequently taught, under the direction of the † Holy Spirit, were likewise *traditional*; as neither were, as far as we can know, committed to writing precisely at the time in which they were delivered. But, although this be the case, yet when he insists that the authority, which the *unwritten word* then had, was not abrogated, because the *written word*, as he implies, was added to it, his argument carries with it its own confutation; since it supposes a point to be proved which cannot be urged against those who deny it. The *precise period*, therefore, at which those traditions, whether *divine* or *apostolical*, were abrogated, was, *when*

* LETTER xi. p. 106.

† See Bellarmine’s distinction, Note (*) p. 3.

they were recorded: the former, in the Gospels ; the latter, in the Epistles.

It is further argued, by * Doctor Milner, that when St. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, it was against “ the superstitions and vain speculations ” of the Jews and Pagan philosophers that he warned them ; and not against apostolical traditions, which he strongly recommended. This, again, is for the purpose of proving that the whole of God’s word is not contained in Scripture, and that the *unwritten* part of it is no less to be received than the *written*. According to the Rhemish version, St. Paul says, † “ hold the *traditions* which ye have learned, whether it be by word, or our epistle.” And our authorized version also reads, “ hold the traditions, &c.” This passage is decisive on the point, in Doctor Milner’s opinion. But I should wish to ask him, what St. Paul understood by those *traditions* ; and particularly, whether he designated by them those traditions which are known to be the constituent parts of the Popish Rule of Faith. If this cannot be proved to be the case, it follows, that the traditions of that church have only an imaginary existence. Whatever facility the proof might derive from the *traditio* of the Vulgate is entirely done away, by referring to the original Greek word, *παράδοσις*, which

* LETTER xi. p. 124.

† 2 Thessal. ii. 15.

is more extensive in its signification; and may imply *a *precept*, an *instruction*, *ordinance*, &c. &c. Now as those *παραδοσεις* were partly oral, partly written, they might as well have referred to *discipline* as to doctrine. This appears from his commanding them afterwards to withdraw themselves †“from every brother that *walketh disorderly*, and not (*κατα την παραδοσιν*) after the *tradition* which he received of us.” So far Doctor Milner accompanies me in the quotation of the apostle’s words. Now let the reader refer to the four next verses; and he will find that the apostle more fully explains himself, and shews, that he had in contemplation the *discipline* and personal conduct of individuals; as he desires them NOT to *walk disorderly*, NOT to *eat the bread of idleness*, and to follow *his* example. I therefore maintain, from this view of the passage, taken by the apostle himself, that those *παραδοσεις*, or *traditions*, as we have it, mean nothing more than *precepts*; and that even the whole of it, but particularly the part cited by Doctor Milner, is altogether irrelevant, and foreign to the purpose for which he produced it. This was the opinion of Coverdale, when, in allusion to similar strictures, he thus expressed

* *Traditions* { doctrines and precepts of God. MACKNIGHT
in loc.
doctrines and injunctions. PARKHURST.

† 2 THESSAL. iii. 6.

himself: * “If,” says he, “we were not deceived by men’s traditions, we should find *no more* diversitie between these terms, than between *fourpence* and a *groat*.”

Were it granted that *παράδοσις* imply doctrines, yet Doctor Milner would gain nothing by the concession, unless, as † Fulke says, this be his argument, “that as all was not written in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, *ergo*, it is no where written, or set down in the Holy Scriptures.” Or, for the sake of explanation, as on the grounds of that concession, there were doctrines delivered by St. Paul to the Thessalonians, which were not specified in the epistle which he addressed to them, I say he would derive no advantage from the concession, unless it followed that they were, therefore, *not recorded* in any of his Epistles to the other churches, or in *any* of the Epistles of the other Apostles, or even in the Gospels themselves. But as a *possibility* exists of their being so recorded, then those *παράδοσις* cease to be *apostolical* traditions, and the argument in favour of their present existence falls to the ground.

But were their existence certain, a difficulty would still arise, how to know the pearl when

* See DEDICATION of his Bible to King Henry VIII.

† See CONFUTATION of the Rhemists, on text 2 Cor. ii. 16.

we have found it. This difficulty, Doctor Milner will tell us, that the fathers, and particularly the precious annotations to the Rhemish Testament, which contain their sentiments, have removed. With respect to the fathers, if they speak of traditions, it is in the most comprehensive sense, including *written* as well as *unwritten* doctrines. In fact, the doctrines of which they treat are those which are principally found in the New Testament. And as to the Rhemish Annotators, their observations are not confined to doctrines; they also extend to *customs* and *ceremonies*. The *fathers sometimes call the Scriptures themselves by the name of tradition; or else they speak of doctrines contained in them, though not set forth in express terms, as the Trinity, the Baptism of Infants, &c. Thus when St. Jerome treats of the *Sacraments* and *Ceremonies* of the church in his time, he refers the former to the Scriptures, and the latter to the *tradition* of the bishops; but is altogether silent about doctrines supposed to have been delivered by the Apostles, that are no where recorded, and yet necessary to salvation. The bare *possibility*, therefore, which exists, of doctrines, which were first *unwritten*, being afterwards embodied in the *written* word,

* ANNOT. on Rhem. Test. p. 663.

is sufficient to defeat Doctor Milner's appeal to the Scriptures on the agitated point.

But, continues he, it is unwarrantable in those Protestant Prelates, Bishops Porteus and Marsh, to compare the essential traditions of religion with ordinary stories; and that * "the Catholic Church (that of Rome, of course) has always guarded them as the apple of her eye." Here again is the *petitio principii*; the thing assumed, which is to be proved. We do not find in the Scriptures, the doctrines of transubstantiation, the worshipping of the host, the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass, the communion under one kind, the grant of indulgences, the praying of souls out of purgatory, the invocation of saints, and the remission of sin through their intercession and merits. Neither do we find those doctrines recorded by any father of the first four centuries; and yet we are told that they are, and ever have been, the doctrines of the church. Now, as Doctor Milner has not specified the precise point of time when those doctrines had a beginning, and as we have sufficient evidence that they were not in existence for *four* centuries, at least, after Christ; we may safely conclude, first, that the Church of Rome, which now teaches those doctrines as *apostolical* traditions, does so on the sole, but compre-

* LETTER xi. p. 107.

hensive principle of its infallibility. Secondly, that the Church of England has had sufficient grounds for refusing to receive them as doctrines having an apostolical origin, from the mere circumstance of the ignorance which exists among the advocates of the rival church, about *where* or *when* they had a beginning, not to speak of its own conviction about the matter. And, lastly, that it is extremely improbable, as * Bishop Marsh most sensibly observes, “that an all-wise Providence, imparting a new revelation to mankind, would suffer *any* doctrine or article of faith to be transmitted to posterity by so precarious a vehicle as that of *oral* tradition.”

Throughout the Letters in which he treats of the “True and False Rules,” Doctor Milner affords repeated instances of the Popish mode of arguing in what is termed a *vicious circle*. With him, the church unerringly determines the authority of Scripture; while the authority of Scripture determines the inerrability of the church. He was sensible that the objection had before been successfully made by Protestant writers, and as if it were in anticipation of its recurrence, he endeavours to elude its force in this fanciful way:—he supposes that a personage calling himself the King’s delegate, and

* COMP. VIEW, p. 67.

whom, from circumstances, he believed to be really such, had presented him with a letter, in which the King expressed his wish that the same credit should be given his messenger's declarations as would be given his own. Here, we may perceive, that the delegate represents the *church*, and the letter the *Scriptures*. He (that is, the church,) decides infallibly on the authority of the letter, *i. e.* the *Scriptures*; while their authority confirms his infallibility. I here ask Doctor Milner, whether this case be like that of the Baptist bearing testimony to Christ, and Christ bearing testimony to the Baptist? Or whether, when * he says "that the (Roman) Catholic Church follows the right rule, and the right rule infallibly leads to the (Roman) Catholic Church," he can deny that this is a mutual testimony which, as running in the vicious circle, is destructive of itself. For, when he believes the *Scriptures*, because the church bids him, and believes the church, because the *Scriptures* bid him; what is it but arguing in a circle, and proving the thing by itself? But I shall not weary the reader's patience with further proofs of such fatuity.

* LETTER L. p. 192.

CHAPTER II.

THE VARIANCE OF THE XIVTH PSALM, AS IT STANDS IN OUR AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE AND BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, ACCOUNTED FOR.

I SHALL not follow Doctor Milner into his labyrinth, as he appropriately calls it, of biblical criticism; but notice his leading objections to our authorized translation of the Bible, as they present themselves. One of these objections is directed against the difference which is found to exist between our Book of Common Prayer and our English Bible, with respect to the FOURTEENTH PSALM.* “Look,” says he, “at Psalm xiv. as it occurs in the Book of Common Prayer, to which your clergy swear their assent and consent; then look at the same Psalm in your Bible: you will find *four whole verses* in the former, which are left out in the latter. You must here say that your church has added to, or else that she has taken away from, the words of this prophecy.”

An inquiry into the cause of this difference between the existing English Translations of the

* LETTER ix. p. 70.

fourteenth Psalm, as well as into the motives by which the reviewers of our Liturgy in 1661 were influenced, when they retained in the Book of Common Prayer the original English version of it, will shew the futility of Doctor Milner's animadversions. If we go so far back as the period when Jerome commenced his biblical labours, we shall find him urged to them by the multiplicity of the Latin versions of the Bible then extant, and by the confusion which prevailed among them. He began by correcting the Psalms; but the people at large, being accustomed to their old version, (*viz.* the *Italic*,) *could not be induced* to lay it aside in favour of one of his substitution. He, therefore, published another edition, with few alterations in the text, but marked where it differed from the Septuagint or the Hebrew. From this *last edition, and the old *Italic*, is formed the vulgate edition of the Psalms now used in the Roman Catholic Church.

We come next to speak of the Psalms as they appear in English, in what is called Cranmer's, or, from its size, the † GREAT BIBLE. The

* See BLACKWALL'S Sacred Classics, vol. ii. p. 341.

† In Grafton and Whitchurch's edition of this Bible in 1540, the four verses alluded to by Doctor Milner are incorporated with the text, but in a *lesser* type—a circumstance that most strongly proves the integrity of our earliest translators.

English Translation of the Psalms, as they stand in the Great Bible, was *exclusively made by Coverdale; for neither Tyndal, nor Rogers, (with whose joint assistance he executed the English version of the entire Bible,) took a part in translating the Psalms. Coverdale, in the execution of his work, derived, as every translator must, important aid from the Seventy and the Latin vulgate; but he disclaims the unlimited use of them, particularly of the latter. I mention this circumstance, to shew Doctor Milner the value attached to the Latin vulgate by our translators. From Coverdale's Bible, then, the Psalms were inserted in Edward the Sixth's Book of Common Prayer, by the †compilers of our Liturgy in 1548; and, for good reasons, which I shall presently assign, were retained by the reviewers of it in 1661, when it was last revised.

As ‡Jerome yielded to the public feeling in giving a second edition of the old Italic version of the Psalms, it is probable that the reviewers of our Liturgy, in 1661, were similarly influ-

* See SHEPHERD on Common Prayer, vol. i. pp. 127, 128.

† *IBID*, Introd. p. xlii.

‡ BUTLER, in his *Horæ Biblicæ*, xiv. 2. observes, "that Jerome began by correcting the Psalms; but the people at large being accustomed to their old version, could not be induced to lay it aside, in favour of St. Jerome's. He therefore published another edition."

enced, and that they too consulted the public taste in retaining the old English Translation of them made by Coverdale. But in doing so, it is more than probable, that they conceived what is now generally admitted among the learned, that the old translation is preferable to the new.

* First, because it is not fettered with the idiom of the Hebrew; and next, because it is expressed with greater freedom and a more perfect accordance to the genius of our own language, than the last translation, which, from too close an adherence to the original, is often more harsh in its constructions, and less harmonious in its periods. It is acknowledged, that obsolete words and phrases, are to be met with in the old translation; but blemishes of this kind are not numerous, and when they do occur, they are sufficiently compensated by the general

* In his Introduction to Morning and Evening Prayer, REEVES accounts for the preference given the old English Translation, from the circumstance of its having "*fewer Hebraisms* in the style, which causes the language to be considered plainer and smoother." SHEPHERD's observations, in the places already quoted, have the same tendency. And KNOX recommends the *adopted* version of the Psalms, with all the persuasiveness of his eloquence, as abounding "with passages exquisitely beautiful, and irresistibly transporting. Even when the sense is not very clear, nor the connexion of the ideas obvious at first sight, the mind is soothed, and the ear ravished, with the powerful yet unaffected charms of style." *Essays Literary and Moral*, No. xlix.

merit of the work. So that, in vindication of the reviewers of our liturgy in 1661, who have been unjustly censured, it may be asserted, that they shewed both taste and judgment in retaining, in our Book of Common Prayer, Coverdale's translation of the Psalms. For, had they not been influenced by the conviction, that it is much better adapted to public worship than any other which appeared in the English language, it may be reasonably inferred, that they would have taken the Psalms, as they did the *lessons, epistles, and gospels*, from King James's translation of 1611.

The preceding paragraph will have shewn Doctor Milner the motives, by which the compilers and reviewers of our Liturgy were actuated, in making the selection they did, and at the same time account for the variance, which he notices between the number of verses contained in the fourteenth Psalm, as inserted in our Book of Common Prayer, and our authorized translation of the Bible. Nor is it more difficult to prove that the Church of England has neither "added to, nor taken away from the word of prophecy." Doctor Milner's main argument to establish this charge rests on the circumstance of the four verses in question being quoted by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, iii. 13. It is true, St. Paul does quote those four verses; but it does not necessarily

follow that he refers to the fourteenth Psalm. His allusions are to Psalms, v. 9.—cxl. 3. and x. 7. Prov. i. 16. Isaiah, lix. 7, 8, and Psalm xxxvi. 1. It should be observed too, that the fifty-third Psalm is in a manner the same as the fourteenth, except as to a slight difference in the sixth verse, and that it does not contain verses *fifth*, *sixth*, and *seventh*, as not being in the Hebrew. It is on this account that * Bythnar, where he analyzes the fourteenth Psalm, does not notice those verses. This will more fully appear, by referring to Archbishop Parker's, or as it is more usually called, the Bishop's Bible, which was published in 1568. In this Bible, the several additions taken from the vulgar Latin, and which are inserted in a *smaller type* in the Great Bible, are omitted, particularly the three verses which were inserted in the fourteenth Psalm. † In Barker's edition also of the English Bible, in 1583, there is a note, setting forth, that the *fifth*, *sixth*, and *seventh* verses of the fourteenth Psalm of the common

* LYRA PROPHETICA, p. 96. See also LEWIS's History of the English Translations of the Bible.

† There are apparently *four* verses more in the version of the fourteenth Psalm, in the Book of Common Prayer, than in that of the Bible; but only *three* in reality, as the *first* verse in the latter is divided into *two* verses in the former. Doctor Milner thinks proper to overlook this circumstance, and to rest his charge on the omission of "*four whole verses!*"

translation are not in the same Psalm, in the Hebrew text; and that they were rather put in “the more fully to express the manners of the wicked:” that they are found in the *fifth*, *one hundred and fortieth*, and *tenth* Psalms, and in the *fifty-ninth* chapter of Isaiah, as also in the *thirty-sixth* Psalm; and that they are alleged by St. Paul, and placed together in the third chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. Now, what can so clearly convey an idea of the candour and judgment of the more ancient and venerable * Translators of our Bible, as this very note; or, more distinctly shew, as their successors can plead the benefit of it, that the authorized translation of the Bible is not, as Doctor Milner pronounces it to be, *defective*; and that St. Paul’s quotation, though not in the fourteenth Psalm, is taken from the places already pointed out?

For the reasons assigned, it appears also, that the cause of the omission of which Doctor Milner complains, was the very best, in fact the only one, that could warrant it; namely, that the Psalms in the Book of Common Prayer

* The curious reader would be abundantly rewarded for his trouble, had he it in his power to consult the different translations and editions of the English Bible themselves, antecedent to the year 1611, on this subject. Sets of those Bibles enrich the splendid Library of TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

were translated from the *Septuagint* and the *Latin Vulgate*; whereas the version of them in our English Bible, was made from the ORIGINAL HEBREW. And lastly, it appears, as the Douay version of the Psalm, which agrees with our *fourteenth, corresponds in substance, though not in the †number of the verses, with the version of the same Psalm, as it stands in our Book of Common Prayer, that Doctor Milner must admit, at least *in foro conscientiæ*, notwithstanding the denunciation of the council of Trent, that the Church of Rome is not justified in sanctioning this very Douay version, as not being made from the original language itself; and that if we be wrong in retaining the interpolated verses in our Prayer Book, that Church would be involved in greater error, did not its infallibility interpose to justify the retention of those very verses in its own authorized Bible.

* This is the thirteenth Psalm in the Sixtine Clementine edition of the Vulgate. It is the thirteenth, in the first Douay version of 1610, vol. ii. p. 33, as it is also in Doctor Troy's last *approved* edition of the Douay Bible, published by *Coyne*, Dublin, 1816.

† The 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th verses in our Book of Common Prayer, constitute the 3d verse in the Douay version. The same exactly occurs in the *Septuagint*, and in the *Latin Vulgate*.

CHAPTER III.

THE TEXT OF THE THREE HEAVENLY
WITNESSES.

HAVING disproved the charge of *defectiveness*, which Doctor Milner has brought against our English Bible respecting the fourteenth Psalm, I proceed to consider one of an opposite description, which he has preferred under the sanction of Bishop Tomline's name, viz. that of *redundancy*, as to a particular text. "The Bishop of Lincoln" (now of Winchester) says * Doctor Milner, "has published his conviction, that the most important passage in the New Testament, 1 John, v. 7, for establishing the divinity of Jesus Christ, is spurious." It is true, that his lordship's opinion is, that the contested passage is *spurious*, for which reason he omits it in the enumeration of proofs from the New Testament towards establishing the doctrine of the Trinity: because, as he says, it would be improper to produce a doubtful text in support of "*so important* a doctrine." But, it is not true, that he attaches any value to the

* LETTER ix. p. 70.

text itself (as Doctor Milner contrives to make him appear to do by the artful connexion he forms between his own opinion, and the Bishop's conviction); consequently, it is not true, that he considers it the *most important* passage in the New Testament for establishing a particular doctrine; nor does he express regret at the absence of the text in question, as affording further confirmation of that doctrine. In short, he does not say one word about *its* importance. In his * Exposition of the FIRST ARTICLE, he confirms the proofs from the Old Testament in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, by such convincing ones from the New Testament—such as our Saviour's commission to the apostles as recorded by † St. Matthew, the doxology of St. Paul in his ‡ Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and the benediction in the beginning of the || Revelations, &c. &c. &c.—that he could well dispense with other aid. For, he well knew, that the text contains nothing but what is abundantly asserted in other places, both with respect to the Trinity in general, and this their divine testimony in particular. This too was Bishop Burnet's opinion. § “There is no need of it,” says that prelate; “for this matter is capable of a very full proof, whether that passage is believed to be a part of the

* Elem. of Theol. vol. ii. p. 90.

† xviii. 19.

‡ xiii. 14.

|| i. 4.

§ ARTICLE I.

Canon, or not." When this is the simple statement of the fact, what shall be said of Doctor Milner, who thus makes assertions, which a reference to the authority, to which he appeals, proves to be unfounded. But even if he did not know that they were so, will ignorance justify error?

The text in the First Epistle of St. John, respecting the three heavenly witnesses, has divided the opinions of many of the ablest divines, and most eminent critical scholars of the present and past century; but as their opinions have not been given as incontrovertible, the matter still lies open to discussion. We find a sharp controversy on this subject carried on between Archdeacon Travis and Professor Porson, originating in the letters of the former to the sceptical *Gibbon. Porson, no less than Gibbon, although with very opposite feelings, maintains that the passage is spurious. To them †Griesbach lends the weight of his testi-

* The following paragraph in Gibbon's History led to the series of letters which Travis wrote to him on the subject. "The three witnesses have been established in our Greek Testaments by the prudence of Erasmus; the honest bigotry of the Complutensian editors; the typographical fraud or error of Robert Stephens in placing a crotchet; and the deliberate falsehood, or strange misapprehension of Theodore Beza."—DECLINE AND FALL, vol. ii. p. 292.

† Griesbach thus briefly sums up the history of the text, 1 John, v. 7. The Complutensian editors first published that

mony; as he says that it was an interpolation from the Latin vulgate in the *fifteenth* or *sixteenth* century, and that there are but two manuscripts extant, which possess the 1 John, v. 7; viz. the * Montfort one belonging to Archbishop Usher's collection in Dublin College, and the Berlin or Ravian one, which is an apograph or transcript from the Complutensian edition. He lays great stress on the *silence* of the Greek fathers, and adds, that in one hundred and thirty-two Greek MSS. which he had examined, the seventh (*comma*) verse was not to be found; and that if so precious and desirable

verse; next Erasmus, in his third or last edition; from these it was transferred into Stephens's editions; thence into those of Beza, and lastly into those of Elzevir.—Appendix, Diatribe in loc. I Joann. v. 7, 8.

* The Montfortian Greek MS., which is preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, though in other respects valuable; yet, it must be admitted, bears evident marks of a modern date. It is on glazed paper, not parchment, and on close inspection exhibits a water-mark in parallel right lines, which the REVEREND DOCTOR BARRET, the learned VICE-PROVOST of our University, ascribes to the reign of Edward the Fourth. Candour obliges me to declare that these circumstances bear Griesbach out in what he says respecting the Montfort MS. I should further observe, that this great critic infers the identity of the *British Codex*, cited by Erasmus, with our Dublin one, in consequence of there not being the minutest difference (*ne unicâ quidem literulâ*) between them respecting the verse in question.

a treasure could any where be discovered, it would long since have been brought to light. Notwithstanding all this mass of evidence against it, and that Bishops Tomline and Marsh have strengthened it by their powerful support; yet as I see such invincible arguments brought forward on the opposite side by the Rev. Mr. Nolan, which are also supported by * other authors of high established reputation, I feel compelled to abandon my former prejudices against it, and to think that a person should almost as soon doubt the genuineness of the rest of St. John's Epistle as that of the disputed passage. This able † writer exhibits the strongest probabilities that Eusebius, who, at the instance of Constantine, had prepared FIFTY written copies of the Scriptures, *had expunged*, rather than that the orthodox had inserted this passage in the sacred text. The *power* with which the emperor's order had invested Eusebius, his *inclination* to exercise that power in the sup-

* BISHOP MANT and the Rev. MR. D'OYLEY have, in their Family Bible, supplied us with the testimonies of Bishops Hall, Beveridge, Horne, and Horsley, in favour of the genuineness of 1 John, v. 7. This circumstance, connected with the temperate and impartial view, which the learned editors themselves take of the subject, fully expresses their own opinion about the matter.

† See NOLAN'S INQUIRY into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, pp. 26, 27.

pression of that particular verse, and the **unlimited sway* of Arianism over the church from the reign of Constantine to that of Theodosius, during a period of forty years, after he had made his revision; the edition thus altered being *peculiarly accommodated* to the opinions of the Arians; the † *errors* into which his hatred to the peculiar notions of Sabellius betrayed ‡ Eusebius; and lastly, the evidence in favour of the contested passage afforded by the § African Church, to the integrity and purity of which, Eu-

* POLE says, “ Et sane cum Ariani essent et *Imperatores*, Constantius, Valens, &c. et *Episcopi*, qui pulsus orthodoxis, totum pene Orbem occupârunt, facile illud *effectum dare potuerunt*.”—SYNOPS. in loc. See also NOLAN’s Inquiry, pp. 28, 29.

† IBID, p. 40.

‡ As Sabellius held that the Father, Word, and Holy Spirit, were three energies in the Divinity, (τρεῖς ἐνεργεῖαι ἐν τῇ Θεοτητί); so he held, that these three energies were *one person*, and thus confounded the *persons* of the Trinity. Marcellus, therefore, and others who leaned towards his error, would not quote 1 John, v. 7, as this text contained the term τρεῖς, which made against their confounding the persons. On the other hand, Eusebius would not appeal to it, on account of its containing the term ἓν, which made as much against his dividing the substance. As neither party, therefore, speak of it during their controversy, Mr. Nolan justly concludes, that its unsuitableness to their respective purposes, was the cause why one expunged the text from his edition of the New Testament, and the other acquiesced in its suppression. Ibid, pp. 305, 528—539, and 563.

§ GIBBON is forced to acknowledge, that this text was alleged by the Catholic Bishops, whom Hunneric convened to

sebius himself has borne the strongest testimony, present more than presumptive proof that it is genuine. Mr. Nolan thus concludes his most useful and elaborate work.—*“ Were the Greek Church the *only* witness of the integrity of the Greek text, or guardian of its purity, the objection that this verse is wholly lost in the Greek Vulgate would be of vital importance. But in deciding the present question, the *African Church* is entitled to a voice no less than the Byzantine; and on *its* testimony we receive the disputed passage. In fact, as the proper witnesses of the inspired word are the Greek and Latin Churches, they are adequate witnesses of its integrity: so that the general corruption of the text received in these churches, in the vast tract of country from Armenia to Africa, was utterly impossible.” But what particularly decides, that the African Church possessed this text in the fifth century, is the very circumstance alluded to by Gibbon; viz. that 400 bishops, who had been summoned to Carthage by Hunneric, an Arian king, to defend their doctrine, had distinctly referred to its authority. And it is not a little remarkable, that that text, whose existence at that period is now so warmly denied, is the very one which

the Conference of Carthage, and that they styled it *luce clarius*.
DECLINE AND FALL, vol. vi. p. 292.

* NOLAN'S INQUIRY, p. 575.

was then best authenticated. In a word, no other controverted verse has been supported by so many bishops of the primitive church.

Although Erasmus at first doubted the genuineness of the British codex, which, according to Griesbach, is no other than the Montfort one; yet we afterwards find him esteeming it of such high authority on account of its antiquity, that he restored this verse in a subsequent edition of his New Testament, which, *to leave no ground of complaint*, he had omitted in a preceding one. These words, *ne cui sit causa calumniandi*, and others expressive of Erasmus's doubts, are dwelt on by Griesbach, to shew that Erasmus attached no importance to the passage; whereas, on the contrary, Erasmus conceived that *it should be read* by the faithful. I should not omit to speak of the still stronger attestations of Ximenes, Laurentius Valla, and Robert Stephens. Of sixteen Greek codices which the last author inspected, this verse was lost only in seven; he followed the authority of the other nine.

If we now refer to an old work, but yet one of eminent authority, Pole's Critical Synopsis, we shall find Mr. Nolan's highest degree of probability strengthened, if not advanced to absolute certainty, respecting the genuineness of the passage in question. First, * he says, that

* POLI SYNOPSIS CRITICORUM in I Epist. Joh., v. 7.

* Jerome in his Prologue to the Catholic Epistles, which he inscribed to Eustochium, complains that this verse concerning the unity of the

* MR. NOLAN here also supplies valuable information, connected with the edition of the Old Italic Vulgate, to which Pole equally refers. He observes, and most certainly with justice, that of the *two* editions of that ancient version made by Jerome, one only, viz. that dedicated to Eustochium, and intended for *private* use, possesses the 1 John, v. 7. In the other, designed for general circulation, and which he undertook at the request of Pope Damasus, he omitted it on the authority of the Greek text, from which Eusebius had removed it.—See INQUIRY, pp. 562, 563. There is likewise an old French version in existence made by the Waldenses, which retains the text of the heavenly witnesses, with the variation of *le filz* for *verbum*, as in the Italic version; but which variation corresponds with the confession of faith used by them. It runs thus, “Trois choses qui donnent tesmoing au ciel, *le pere, le filz, et le saint esperit*, et ces trois sont une chose.” From this coincidence, as well as the collateral circumstance of the French version in the Lord’s Prayer, “*ne nous mene mye en temptacion*,” being the same with that in the old Italic one, *ne inducas nos in temptationem*; we may conclude, that 1 John, v. 7, existed in that old Italic version, from which the Waldenses made their translation, and that it was remotely adopted from Cyprian by Eusebius Vercellensis, who revised that version; and consequently, that it existed previously to the introduction of either of Jerome’s two editions of the Vulgate spoken of above. IBID. Pref. p. xix. The Waldenses occupied the very district, which was formerly called the Italic diocese. To that people, therefore, we owe the preservation of this important text, no less than the first risings of that spirit of resistance to Papal tyranny and usurpation, which after a lapse of ages, has been, through the blessing of God, instrumental in establishing our civil and religious liberties.

Trinity was omitted (*infidelibus*) by the *Arian* interpreters; and then argues on the grounds subsequently stated, that one or other of two things must have happened, * either that the verse was removed by them, or added by the orthodox; but that of the two, the former was by far the *most probable*. Pole next alludes to the periods, when Tertullian, Cyprian, and Athanasius cited it; and states, that Idacius in the reign of Theodosius, A. D. 380, produced it against the Arians. His own arguments on this subject are quite conclusive. He contends that the Arians must have cancelled the *seventh* verse rather than the orthodox forged it; because, if genuine, it convicted them of heresy, if fabricated, the doctrine of the Trinity is abundantly proved from other parts of Scripture. I shall content myself with noticing the argument which he derives from the internal evidence of the thing itself, viz. of the context, and the end which St. John had in view when

* POLE's words are : *Scopus Epistolæ Generalis est veræ de Christo doctrinæ confirmatio, idque contra Ebionem et Cerinthum, qui Deitatem Christi negabant - - - - - hoc imprimis credendum docet, quod Jesus sit Christus. i. e. verus Deus, et verus Homo - - - - - quæ etiam probare voluit Johannes per testes et divinos et humanos, de quibus omnibus conjunction, v. 6.—de divinis, hoc versu, 7.—de humanis, v. 8. deinde addit, v. 9. “ Si testimonium hominum recipiamus, testimonium Dei majus est.”* Explicat manifeste, quod de sex testibus dixerat, tres seorsim calo, tres terræ tribuens.—Crit. Synops. in loc.

he wrote the epistle. St. John's object, as * Pole justly observes, was to oppose Ebion and Cerinthus, who denied the divinity of Christ, and consequently, to establish it as an article of faith, that JESUS WAS THE CHRIST, TRUE GOD AND TRUE MAN, by witnesses human and divine. As, therefore, it treats of a two-fold description of witnesses, if we acknowledge the *seventh* as genuine, no chasm will occur by the absence of the divine testimony; and the *eighth* speaks of that which is human. The apostle then adds the *ninth* verse, which has as evident reference to the *seventh*, as to the *sixth* verse; for he says, "if we receive the witness of *men*, the witness of God is greater," and thus demonstrates, that he had spoken of the †*six* witnesses:—three distinct ones in heaven, and three on earth. To direct us therefore to judge between the value of the proofs brought forward on the one side by Griesbach, and on the other by Pole, their internal evidence at once shews,

* See note, p. 51.

† BISHOP HORSLEY judiciously observes, that St. John "describes the unity of the testimony of the three celestial, and the three terrestrial witnesses, in different terms; I conceive for this reason: of the latter more could not be said with truth, than that they *agree in one*; but the three in Heaven being in substance and in nature one, he asserts the agreement of their testimony in terms which predicate their substantial unity; that he might not seem to lower his own doctrine." (See BISHOP MANT'S Family Bible in loc.) Thus does this great critical scholar assert the genuineness of the text in question.

that error lies on the side of the former, that is, on the side of the Greek Church; as the testimony which it affords is not so full as that afforded by an equally competent witness—the * African Church; and as such testimony is not consistent, when considered by itself. Nothing, therefore, can be more evident, from every view of the case, than that this passage, if it be genuine, is neither decisive; nor is it, as Doctor Milner says, the *most important* in the New Testament towards establishing the Divinity of Christ. If it be genuine, I maintain, that it is not in any respect a *corner-stone* of the Temple. If it be spurious; it is only a *hewn-stone*.

It is now hoped, that the reader has been satisfied by the preceding illustration, that Doctor Milner's charge of *redundancy* respecting the text of the Heavenly Witnesses, against

* MR. NOLAN, having traced the history of the disputed text, through the Sabellian and Eutychian controversies, and stated the probable causes of its omission in the Greek manuscripts, and in the writings of the Greek fathers; and having assigned the reason, why Jerome inserted it in one, and omitted it in the other, of his editions of the Latin Vulgate, (see note * p. 50) presents his reader with an induction of the most conclusive arguments in support of its genuineness. "The objections," he says, "raised against that text, are perfectly consistent with that strong evidence in its favour, which is deducible from the *internal evidence and the external testimony of the African Church*."—INQUIRY, p. 564.

our authorized English version of the Bible, merits the fate of that preferred against it on the score of *defectiveness*, in the case of the fourteenth Psalm.

ALTHOUGH there be no connexion whatever between the subject matter of Bishop Watson's Charge, and the text of the heavenly witnesses, yet as Doctor Milner has thought proper to blend them together in the same letter, I shall not attempt to separate them. Next to Bishop Tomline, that prelate comes under his animadversions. * According to him, nothing but doubt and uncertainty hang over the days of our greatest divines, and most profound scriptural students; if reference be had to their publications. And, as if to prove the truth of his assertion, he cites *two whole* sentences from the Bishop of Landaff's Charge to his Clergy in 1795! But before the reader knows what this proof is, he must be prepared to be *horror struck* at the address of this protestant bishop, who after exploring the depths of scripture to the utmost extent of reason, and all the commentators who have written on it, acknowledges that his mind is *unsettled* about the doctrines of Christianity. After a preparation to this effect, Doctor Milner introduces the bishop, on the topic of the

* LETTER IX. p. 78.

Christian doctrines, as saying, * “ I think it safer to tell you, *where* they are contained, than *what* they are. They are contained in the Bible, and if in reading that book, your sentiments concerning the doctrines of Christianity, should be different from those of your neighbour, or *from those of the church*, be persuaded on your part, that infallibility appertains as little to you, as it does to the church.” These certainly were the words of that learned and intelligent bishop, but a little enquiry will satisfy us, that they by no means shew, as Doctor Milner asserts, how far removed his lordship was from the assurance of faith; nor how fallacious the rule of the mere Bible must be. It will further satisfy us, that no reader should, without investigation, express surprise, much less “ *shudder*,” at the perusal of a partial and isolated extract, and that it would not involve the Church of England in either shame or disgrace, as Doctor Milner insists it would, if it even proved, that it led to a diversity of sentiments among its members.

I am far from being an apologist of this prelate’s general character; because I consider it, whether it relates to the consistency of his conduct, or the orthodoxy of his principles, as altogether *indefensible*. But candour obliges me to declare, that if I can believe the evidence

* BISHOP WATSON’S Charge to his Clergy, 1795.

which now lies before me, I must believe, that, if any man knew what the Christian doctrines were ; who was capable not merely of ascertaining, but of accurately defining them, and into whose vigorous and intuitive mind, doubt and error were little likely to enter ; that person was DOCTOR WATSON. So that, to determine what the opinion of that eminent divine was, respecting the Bible as a rule of faith, and the doctrines which it contains, we must enlarge the view, which Doctor Milner has given us, and collect it from the scope of his entire charge, and not confine ourselves to a detached passage. “ When we speak,” says Bishop Watson, “ concerning the truth of revealed religion, we include not only the certainty of the divine missions of Moses and Jesus, but the nature of the several doctrines, promulgated by them to mankind. Now, you may ask me what those doctrines are? *I know what they are to me*, but pretending to no degree of infallibility, I think it safer to tell you where they are contained, than what they are.” And so on to the end of Doctor Milner’s quotation, as already given.

I now ask Doctor Milner, in the name of candour and honest dealing, whether he has done justice to Bishop Watson, in citing a garbled extract from his charge ; and not rather grossly misrepresented him, where he said, that his lordship was forced publicly to confess to

his assembled clergy, that he *could not tell them, what the doctrines of Christianity* were? Bishop Watson not able to tell what they were!—and yet but seven words intervene, between Doctor Milner's quotation, and the Bishop's emphatic declaration!—*I know what they are to me.* Is this the language of doubt and uncertainty? Does it not rather express the strength of his conviction, and the fulness of the assurance of his faith?

If we now consider the occasion on which this prelate spoke, we shall have reason to admire his prudent reserve, as much as the sententious brevity of his language. Were he delivering a lecture as professor of divinity, he might, and no doubt would, point out and define the Christian doctrines; but in an episcopal charge, he more properly stimulated the industry of his clergy to explore the sacred source itself, whence those doctrines were derived. With that becoming diffidence so peculiar to the divines of the Church of England, he stated, that he knew what they were *to himself*; but as he pretended to no degree of infallibility, and as he knew that his opinion was *liable* to error, he encouraged each individual of his clergy to the active exercise of his reason; to prosecute vigorous inquiry; to disclaim all authority; and to rest satisfied with nothing short of what he conscientiously believed to be the truth. Such seems

to me to be the tendency of this distinguished prelate's advice; such is the spirit of Protestantism, and in such a spirit was the work of the reformation achieved. When, therefore, Doctor Milner speaks of the doubt and uncertainty of the Protestant clergy, about doctrinal points of divinity, he cannot expect to be believed except by Popish readers. For he well knows, that the privilege which we exercised, of *judging for ourselves*, when we withdrew from the Church of Rome, we must consistently extend to those of our own communion; otherwise, we should act as reprehensibly as that church, in setting ourselves up as infallible judges; and that although, from the latitude thus allowed, some of our clergy, or laity, may separate from us, who have not what we had to urge, when our separation from the former took place; viz. the *plea* of conscience; yet, the greatest evil resulting from the abuse of this liberty is a very trifle, when compared with the evil of a restraint, which controls the will and enslaves the conscience.

I shall now close my defence of Bishop Watson, by presenting the reader with the concluding part of that paragraph in his charge, from which Doctor Milner has made his mutilated extract. It goes to confirm the justice of the observations, which I have offered; while it removes from us the imputation of doubt and un-

certainly about matters affecting our salvation. After recommending those graces, which adorn the Christian character—respect and reverence towards the church, and towards individuals, “charity of thought and courtesy of conduct,” the bishop thus proceeds, “many learned men have bestowed much useless labour, in defining what are the fundamental verities of the Christian religion; useless I esteem it, because the same things are not fundamental to all men, and there is no *infallible* judge of controversy to settle the disputes which may arise. A Papist believes the doctrine of transubstantiation, of worshipping of images, of invocation of saints, of purgatory, of the *insalvability* (if the word may be admitted) of heretics, and of the infallibility of Popes, councils, and churches, to be fundamental doctrines. A Protestant does not believe any of those doctrines to be fundamental. Protestants differ from each other in their sentiments concerning the Eucharist; concerning the Trinity; concerning satisfaction; concerning original sin; and personal predestination—but the wisest among them do not esteem any particular opinion concerning any of those points to be so *fundamentally right*, that *salvation will not belong to those, who think otherwise.*”

CHAPTER IV.

OUR AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE
VINDICATED.

THEY, who executed the authorized and revered translation of our Bible, anticipated such uncharitable imputations as those cast on it by Doctor Milner. They well knew, when even *Jerome did not escape censure for what he had so ably performed; that however, †“the innocencie of a good conscience,” might, at the time, have “supported” them under the obloquy of “selfe-conceited brethren;” yet that it would shield neither themselves, nor their labours from future aggression. Of the justice of these anticipations, we have a memorable instance in the ‡END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY. “Had the Protestants,” says Doctor Milner, “demonstrative evidence, that the several books in their Bible

* Ruffin, Augustin, and other learned men, vilified both Jerome and his labours; and “interpreted his Latin translation of the Bible as done (*in contumeliam τῶν ὁ*) to the disparagement of the seventy.” See WALTON’S Considerator considered, p. 3, edit. 1659.

† The EPISTLE DEDICATORIE of the Translators of the Bible, in 1611, to King James.

‡ LETTER ix. p. 70.

were canonical and authentic (*genuine* he must again mean) in the originals, it would still remain doubtful, that they are faithfully translated in their English copy; a consequence of their rejecting the great universal church, and building upon that of some *obscure* translator in the reign of James I." He further observes, "that the Bibles of Tindal, Coverdale, and Queen Elizabeth's bishops, were *so notoriously* corrupt, as to cause a *general outcry* against them, among learned Protestants, as well as among (Roman) Catholics, in which King James himself joined; and accordingly, that he ordered a new version, that now in use, to be made. And that though the new translators corrected many wilful errors of their predecessors; yet, that a *sufficient number* remain behind, for which their advocates offer *no excuse*."

Here is a series of charges levelled at the integrity and skill of our translators, and at the fidelity of our translation. Frequently as they have been made by popish divines they have never been preferred with a greater air of superciliousness; nor with less pretensions to truth, than in the present instance. Ignorant of the Hebrew, and but imperfectly acquainted with the Greek language, according to his own avowal, Doctor Milner delivers an opinion, which can only be sustained by a perfect knowledge of both languages. If Mr. Bellamy, and

Sir James Bland Burges have, in their late * publications, had the hardihood to condemn the received Translation of our English Bible, as imperfect, and its authors, as incompetent to execute so important a work ; their opinions, however precipitate and erroneous, are entitled to a certain degree of deference. The attempt, which the former gentleman has made to supersede our present English Translation, by what he calls a *new* and *more perfect* one of his own, even though such an attempt has been unsuccessful, bespeaking as it does great proficiency in the original languages, claims indulgence, even commands a respect, compared with what the arrogant dogmas of a superficial critic deserve.

Doctor Milner, indeed, may be competent to pronounce an opinion on the merits of a translation made from the Latin Vulgate solely ; but no farther can he go. The consequence of this disparity between his and Mr. Bellamy's knowledge, is this ; that while equal violence is manifested by both assailants, the mode of assault on our authorized English Bible varies. The one objects, that it is not translated according to the Hebrew, in the Old, and to the original

* THE HOLY BIBLE newly translated from the original Hebrew, with notes critical and explanatory by JOHN BELLAMY ; and REASONS in favour of a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures, by SIR JAMES BLAND BURGESS, BART.

Greek in the New, Testament; but that it is derived from the Septuagint and the Latin Vulgate. The other tries its merits, if not by the Septuagint, at least by the Latin Vulgate, and is equally loud in its dispraise, as not being conformable thereto. Both are wrong. Mr. Bellamy is so; because the translators of 1611, although they did not disdain the use, either of the Seventy, or of the Latin Vulgate, and although they even occasionally consulted our early English versions; yet they looked to nothing *as authority*, but the *Hebrew* text of the OLD, and the *original Greek* of the NEW, Testament. For, as they express themselves in their * preface or epistle to the reader; if you ask, what they had before them, “truely it was *the Hebrew text* of the Olde Testament, *the Greeke* of the New. *These are the two golden pipes, or rather conduits, where-through the olive branches empty themselves into the golde.*” But, Doctor Milner is still more in error, in setting up the Latin Vulgate as a standard by which our insulted version is to be tried. It was in this way that †Racine judged of Milton, and in which Voltaire criticised Shakspeare; not viewing them as they should have done, in the original English, but probably through an imperfect French

* Translators' PREFACE to King James's Bible of 1611.

† See GEDDES's Prospect, p. 92.

or Latin medium. But if the opinions of these critics must have necessarily been erroneous, how much less to be regarded must Doctor Milner's criticism be; when he judges of our English Bible, not by that from which it is derived; but by one, which neither is, nor can be, a fair representation of it, inasmuch as it does not flow purely from the source itself? For as the *translators say, the Latin is not "the precedent or originall tongue;" nor "the fountain," whence the stream of living water first issued. What they afterwards add is alike applicable to both those gentlemen, and confirms the truth of what I have here stated. † "The credit of the olde bookes, according to Gratian, is to be tried by the Hebrew volumes; so of the new, by the Greek tongue, he meaneth the original Greek. If a trueth be to be tried by these tongues, then *whence* should a translation be made, but *out of them*. These tongues, therefore, the Scriptures, we say, in these tongues, were set before us to translate, BEING THE TONGUES WHEREIN GOD WAS PLEASED TO SPEAKE TO HIS CHURCH BY HIS PROPHETS AND APOSTLES." In such emphatic terms is *that standard*, by which Doctor Milner would try our authorised Translation of the Bible, comparatively lowered by those venerable persons.

* Preface to the Bible of 1611.

† *IBID.*

Mr. Bellamy I now resign to the literary castigations of * Mr. Whittaker, as well as to those of the † Quarterly and ‡ British Critic Reviewers, from whom he has already experienced not unmerited treatment ; while I confine myself to the consideration of Doctor Milner's charges. As this gentleman possesses both rank and influence in the Roman Catholic Church, which impart an air of candour and truth to every thing he says, it is for me to shew to what purposes he perverts those advantages, and with what gross injustice he vilifies our received Translation of the Bible, no less than its learned and pious authors.

It has been the lot of our industrious, zealous, and truly learned Translators, to have their labours undervalued and their characters aspersed by Popish writers for the last two centuries ; yet the Church of England has called their work *blessed*, and has uniformly paid their memories the tribute of its veneration and gratitude. And, although they have, like other men, descended to the grave, and are now equally insensible to the voice of calumny or praise, their reputation for learning will never die but with the decay of the English language. It is, therefore, little to be regarded that an individual

* See his HISTORICAL and CRITICAL ENQUIRY into the Interpretation of the Hebrew SS.

† See Numbers 37 and 38. ‡ See Number for April, 1820.

like Doctor Milner, who cannot stand a competition with even the *obscurest* of them on the score of learning and talents, should occasionally step forward from the pale of his infallible Church, to impeach their motives, or deny their competence for an undertaking, which they have so happily accomplished. That they were possessed of every qualification suited to their task, the world of letters abundantly testifies. Their contemporaries paid them due honours when alive; and since their death their memories have been esteemed in proportion to the increase of sound learning; and I trust that, for generations to come, their wisdom and knowledge will be lauded in the congregation of the people. The language of congratulation addressed by the learned Fulke to the British nation on the production and effect of the first English Versions of the Bible, is still more applicable, in reference to the treasure which these our *last* Translators have bequeathed us. * “Happy, and thrice happy,” says that venerable advocate of our Church, “hath our English nation bene, since God hath given learned translators to express in our mother tongue the heavenly mys-

* “A DEFENSE of the sincere and true translations of the holie Scriptures into the English tong, against the manifold cavils, frivolous quarrels, and impudent slaunders of GREGORY MARTIN, one of the readers of Popish Divinitie in the trayterous Seminarie of Rheims, by WILLIAM FULKE, D. D., and Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.” Ed. 1583.

teries of his holy worde, delivered to his Church in the Hebrew and Greek languages. Who, although they have in some matters of no importance unto salvation, as men, bene deceived, yet have they faithfully delivered the whole substance of the heavenly doctrine, conteyned in the Holy Scriptures, without any hereticall translations, or wilful corruptions. And in the whole Bible, among them all, have committed as few oversights, for any thing that you can bring, and of *less importance* than you have done only in the New Testament.”

Notwithstanding Dr. Milner's reproach, the curious reader will perceive that there was not an *obscure*, by which, of course, he means an *illiterate* individual among the * forty-seven translators of our Bible, named in the original list, and approved by King James the First, if he only consult † Mr. Todd's late vindication of it. So much additional information to that already recorded has been supplied by this

* According to the *Fifteenth* Rule laid down by the King, and to be observed by the Translators, seven of the most ancient and grave divines of Oxford and Cambridge, were appointed *overseers* of the Translation, which increased the number to *fifty-four*; although Doctor Milner will not allow that so many were engaged in the work. See BURNER'S Hist. of the Reform. Coll. Vol. ii. P. ii. p. 368.

† VINDICATION of our authorized Translation and Translators of the Bible, by the Rev. H. I. Todd, Keeper of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Records, pp. 49—65.

gentleman's industry, from the Lambeth MSS. that there remain but few of the learned characters concerned in framing our authorized Translation, about whom something is not known. It is true, that they did not all attain an equal degree of celebrity; nor were they all equally fortunate in leaving after them a biographer to procure them a posthumous reputation. Some of them were secluded scholars, enjoying the shade of academic retirement, while others were engaged in the humble discharge of their pastoral duties, and had never attained that eminence in the church, which would have attracted public attention. It is only on grounds such as these, that Doctor Milner can object to us the obscurity of those learned and estimable men.

To Mr. Todd's research are the public also indebted for a more circumstantial list of the Translators than that published either by Burnet or Lewis, and for important information respecting some of them, not generally known. So completely has he filled up the biographical chasm which existed, that *five* only of the entire number remain, with whose characters and attainments we are unacquainted: viz. Doctors Hutcheson and Spenser, Mr. Fenton, Mr. Rabbett, and Mr. Sanderson. By the way, an opinion has been hazarded, that the Mr. Sanderson, who was advanced to a fellowship in Lincoln College, in 1606, and afterwards to the

Bishopric of Lincoln; the author of EPISCOPACY, and the reputed author of that inimitable prayer in our Liturgy, the * General Thanksgiving, was the last of the five mentioned. His literary rank qualified him for the office of a Translator, and what makes it probable that he was one of them, is, that the business of translation was not set about, until the beginning of 1607. However this be, the five already spoken of were in what was called the second division of the Westminster Class, to which also belonged † Dakins, a Professor of Divinity in Gresham College, and Barlow, the historian of the Conference at Hampton Court. It may, therefore, be fairly presumed, that even *these two*, who ranked so high for scholarship, although there were *no* general conference, *no* supervision of the entire translation; would have taken care to preserve the version of the Epistles, which was consigned

* As the *thanksgiving* was not added to our Liturgy until 1661, it remains a question, whether the Sanderson who was said to be its author, could have been the same Sanderson who was engaged forty-four years before that period in translating our Bible. The opinion of my late esteemed Diocesan, BISHOP BENNET, as appears from his MS. notes on our Book of Common Prayer, which has lately come into my hands, determines in the *negative*, in which he is supported by WHEATLEY, SHEPHERD, &c.

† Ward, in his *Lives of the Professors of Gresham College*, says, that DAKINS was employed in this work on account of his skill in the *original languages*, p. 46.

to them, free from error. In addition to this, we can form a favourable estimate of the talents and learning of the five in question, from what is known of the great body of their associates. This we are further assisted in doing by the tenour of the King's commission, * "authorizing forty-seven dignitaries, and *eminent* churchmen, and *scholars*, to meet, confer, and consult together, so that nothing should pass without a general consent:" also, by the purport of his Majesty's declaration at Hampton Court, about one uniform translation, † "to be done by the *best learned* in both universities; after them to be reviewed by the bishops, and the *chief learned* of the Church:" and, lastly, by what his Majesty says in his letter to Bancroft, Bishop of London, about promoting those meritorious persons, viz. that ‡ "whereas, we have appointed certain *learned* men to the number of *four and fifty* for the translating of the Bible, and that in this number, divers of them have either no ecclesiastical preferment at all, or else so very small, as the same is *far unmeet* for men of their *deserts*. We, therefore, ordain, &c. &c." So that, whether the Translators be considered individually, according to their divi-

* FULLER's Church History, p. 40.

† SUM AND SUBSTANCE of the Conference at Hampton Court, by Dr. Barlow, Dean of Chester, p. 46.

‡ See APPENDIX IV., to Todd's Vindication.

sions, or in their collective capacity; Doctor Milner's charge, that the translation of any particular text, is that of some *obscure*, or unknown, or illiterate Translator; that it is *notoriously corrupt*, and one, on which it is *dangerous* to rely, is directly refuted: inasmuch as the whole English version is a joint production, the work of one being the work of all; what each did separately, was revised, corrected, and approved only "*by general consent.*"

The most interesting and important editions of the English Bible, which were antecedent to our authorized one, are those mentioned in the following page. Before it arrived at its present state, it may be said to have passed through several stages, and at each, to have acquired a degree of improvement, which was itself surpassed by a succeeding revision. Thus, in the space of seventy years preceding the date at which the last was undertaken by command of King James the First; our English Bible was revised at several distinct periods. As, therefore, the correctness of this last version, its beauty of language, and simplicity of style, have not been superseded by any successful attempt at further improvement, it is to be hoped, before any future revision takes place, that its necessity will be clearly established.

Before I enter more fully into this subject, it becomes necessary to inquire, with what jus-

tice Doctor Milner asperses even the English versions of the Bible, which preceded this last one; those, for instance, of Tyndal, Coverdale, and Queen Elizabeth's bishops, which he says, were also notoriously corrupt; and to ascertain the grounds, on which, he alleges, that an outcry was raised against them.

We know, that Wickliff published, in the fourteenth century, a translation of the whole Bible in the English then spoken; but, that it was suppressed at the instigation of those, * "who were for taking away the key of knowledge," by the 13th Rich. II. And with respect to Tyndal's partial translation of the Scriptures, the first Protestant English one made, we find Geddes himself, whose authority will not be very acceptable to Doctor Milner, in his prospectus of a new translation of the Bible, speaking of it in high terms; and that though far from being a perfect one, yet few first translations would be found preferable to it. It is astonishing, he observes, † "how little obsolete the language of it is, even at this day; and in point of perspicuity and noble simplicity, propriety of idiom, and purity of style, no English version has yet surpassed it." Again he says, had he been inclined to make any English version the ground-work of his

* LEWIS'S History of the Translations of the Bible, p. 25.

† IBID.

own, it would certainly have been *Tyndal's. Such was the judgment of that very eminent scholar about the matter, and willingly, or not, Doctor Milner must bow to an authority, which Archbishop Newcome acknowledged as decisive, when he cited it.

Of Coverdale's Bible, we have the distinct admission of Gardiner himself, as recorded by the learned † Fulke, that it could not be notoriously corrupted, as it set forth no heresies. "I myself," says that able vindicator of the English translations of the Bible, "did heare that reverend father, M. Doctor Coverdale, of holie and learned memorie, in a sermon at St. Paul's Crosse, upon occasion of some slaunderous reportes, that then were raised againste his translation, declare his faithful purpose in doing the same, which, after it was finished and presented to king Henry the Eight of famous memorie, and by him committed to diverse bishops of that time to peruse, of which, (as I remem-

* Lewis, when speaking of Tyndal's qualifications as a translator, expressly asserts, that he rendered the Scriptures "from the original *Hebrew and Greek* into English."—IBID. In his Prologue to the Translation of the Pentateuch, Tyndal affirms, what he could not have said, had he translated solely from the Latin. "They that konne well the sentence of holy writ, and English together, and wolen travaile with Godis grace thereabout, monne make the Bible as true and as open, yea and openlier in English, than it is in Latyn."

† DEFENSE *ut supr.* p. 4.

ber,) *Steven Gardiner* was one; after they had kept it long in their hands, and the king was diverse times sued unto for the publication thereof, at the last, being called for by the king himself, they redelivered the book; and being demanded by the king, but are there any heresies mayntained thereby?—they answered, that there were *no heresies*, that they could finde, maintayned thereby. If there be *no heresies*, said the king, then in God's name, let it go abroad among our people." This single admission of Gardiner speaks volumes, and if to it, and the direct evidence of Fulke, be added the testimony of *Mr. Whittaker, in behalf of Coverdale's Bible, its merit will be put beyond any question.

The passages in which Coverdale forsook both the Septuagint and the Vulgate are numerous. His policy in not openly declaring this, was wise, as he would thereby have endangered his personal safety without promoting the sacred cause in which he was engaged. To this, probably, we have to attribute his escaping the fate of Tyndal; for when both himself and his Bible were seized on in Paris by the officers of the Inquisition, the latter only was committed to the flames. But it is more than probable, had Coverdale followed the old Latin text word for word, that Doctor Mil-

* See Critical Enquiry, p. 51—56.

ner would not have so violently exclaimed against his translation. The reason for his not having done so, is thus admirably stated in his * **Dedication to the King**: “as though al were not as nye the truth to translate the Scripture out of other languages, as to turne it out of Latyn: or as though the Holy Goost were not the authoure of his Scripture as well in the Hebrew, Greke, French, Dutche, and English, as in Latyn.” However this be, the objections, which Doctor Milner now raises to Coverdale’s translation, were not such as to deter Roman Catholics from continuing to join in the communion of the Established Church, in the early part of queen Elizabeth’s reign. I may specify Coverdale’s Bible, as the alterations peculiar to Cranmer’s edition were few and unimportant.

We come next to consider Doctor Milner’s charge as it bears against the † **BISHOPS’ BIBLE**. ‡ Selden, whom § Cudworth styles the glory of the English nation for oriental literature, and who is known to have been no way partial to the Church of England; likewise a man, who

* See HOLLYBUSH’s quarto edition of the New Testament, 1538. See also, LEWIS’s Hist. of Eng. Transl.

† So called, because of the majority of the persons engaged in it being of Episcopal rank, viz. Abps. Sandys and Grindal; Bps. Alley, Davies, Bentham, Cox, and Horne.

‡ TABLE TALK, p. 5. Ed. 1716.

§ DISC. ON the Lord’s Supper, p. 16.

in forming his opinions, was seldom, if ever, guided by the judgment of others, represents “the English translation of the Bible, as the *best* in the world, and which renders the sense of the original best; taking in for the English translation, the *Bishops’ Bible*, as well as king James’s.” Thus, in the opinion of this independent man, and profound scholar, the Bishops’ Bible ranks equally high as a translation with King James’s; and if, as is universally admitted, his judgment be decisive, that *either* of these is the best translation in the world: it follows, that the Bishops’ Bible is at least as free from heresy, as Coverdale’s was pronounced to be by Gardiner; and therefore, not, as Doctor Milner says, notoriously corrupt. My argument here, is grounded on Selden’s attestation to the excellence of the Bishops’ Bible as a translation, and the answer given Henry VIII. by Gardiner, respecting Coverdale’s Bible, as already stated. But it is further strengthened by the fact, that the Bishops made the preceding English versions of Tyndal and Coverdale, the models; and, as it were, the basis of their own. Again, Fulke, whom I have already represented as the first and ablest advocate of our English versions, bears direct testimony here also, to the zeal, the talents, and the learning of the Bishops employed in the work; and while with candour,

he admits the possible existence of such imperfections as cannot always be guarded against ; yet he successfully vindicates the faithfulness of the Translation, no less than the honesty of the Translators. * “ ‘That some error,’ says he, addressing himself to the Rhemish -doctors, “ may bee in translation, although by you it cannot be shewed, I will not deny ; but that any *shameless* translations, or *wilful* corruptions can be found of purpose to draw the Scriptures to any hereticall opinion, *all the Papists in the world* shall never be able to make demonstration.” If this opinion of Fulke, and that of King James’s Translators, be deemed decisive ; the reputation of the Bishops’ Bible will not have been endangered by Doctor Milner’s censures. Those Translators, speaking of the English versions antecedent to their own, say, † “ that all is sound for substance, in one or other of our editions, and the worst of ours is *far better* than the authentick vulgar of the Papists.” As for the estimation, in which King James himself held the Bishops’ Bible, it may be collected from the first of his instructions to the translators, where he orders, ‡ “ that the ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly

* See DEFENSE, pp. 340, 521—524, and pp. 45, 46, of PREFACE.

† PREFACE, or Epistle to the Reader, Transl. of 1611.

‡ Burnet’s Hist. of the Reform., vol. ii. Part ii. p. 365.

called the BISHOPS' BIBLE, be followed, and as *little* altered, as the truth of the original will permit." Such are the memorials of the earliest of what Doctor Milner calls our *notoriously corrupt* English versions.

"But," continues Doctor M., "there was an *outcry* raised against those Bibles among learned Protestants and (Roman) Catholics, in which King James himself joined." When he speaks of learned Protestants, he would lead his reader to suppose, that he meant learned divines of the Church of England, as objecting to the English versions of the Bible; whereas he, in fact, alludes to the *Puritans*. Now, that the Puritans did not raise this alleged outcry against *our* biblical corruptions, as he calls them, appears, in the first place, from this one circumstance, that, at the Conference held at Hampton Court, where their complaints would have been attended to, there was *no* discussion whatever, on any subject of the kind. And in the next place, instead of an outcry, a petition was presented to the King by the non-conformists, desiring reformation of sundry ceremonies. But most certainly, there was no outcry, and but an accidental mention of a revision or correction of the English Bibles, at the Conference. Their object was to discuss matters respecting the *doctrine* and *discipline* of the Church; and it was for this purpose exclusively, that it was

held. The substance of the petition or remonstrance, which they then presented to his Majesty, proves this to be the case. It was drawn up under the following heads: 1. *The Service of the Church. 2. Church Ministers. 3. The Livings and Maintenance of the Church. And 4thly. The Discipline of it. The historian relates, that the petitioners were unsuccessful in obtaining what they had in view. †“They sped no better,” says Heylin, “in relation to the forms of worship, than they had done in reference unto points of doctrine.” It is true, the same writer adds, “*somewhat* also was observed, touching some errors in the old translation of the English Psalter, as also in the Gospels and Epistles, as they stood in the *Liturgy*. But, their objections were *so stale*, and *so often answered*, that the bishops and conformable party went away with an easy victory.” But surely, an allusion, which was thus incidentally made to *some* alleged mistranslations in certain parts of the Liturgy, as in the Psalter, the Epistles and Gospels; as well as the complaints, which were preferred by the disappointed party, but not until the object of their petition was defeated, cannot be considered what Doctor Milner calls “*an outcry*” against the English versions of the Bible.

* HEYLIN'S History of the Presbyterians, p. 370.

† *IBID.* p. 373.

The King himself states the causes of the complaints, which gave rise to the conference ; viz. such as dissensions in the church ; disobedience to the laws ; and a great falling away to Popery. His purpose, therefore, was * “ like a good physician, to examine and try the complaints, and fully to remove the occasions thereof.” Not the remotest allusion to complaint against *any* English translation occurs in the Royal statement. It seems, indeed, that on that occasion, Doctor Reinolds, *one* of the petitioners, † “ moved his Majesty, that there might be a new translation of the Bible ;” assigning as a reason, that the English versions then extant, “ were not answerable to the truth of the originall.” But this request was not made by him until the *second* day of the conference, as the historian says, after they had been speaking upon several other subjects. The Translators themselves, in their preface or epistle to the reader, echo the words of the King. ‡ “ The very historical truth,” say they, “ is, that upon the importunate petitions of the Puritans at his Majesty’s coming to this crown, the conference at Hampton Court having been appointed for hearing complaints, when by force of reason, they were put from all *other* grounds, they *had*

* BARLOW’S Sum and Substance, &c. *ut sup.* p. 5.

† Ibid. p. 46.

‡ Bible of 1611.

recourse at the last *to this shift*, that they could not with good conscience subscribe to the Communion Book, since it maintained the Bible, as it was there translated, which was, as they said, a most corrupted translation. And although, this was judged to be but a poor and empty shift; yet even hereupon, did his Majesty bethink himself of the good, that might ensue by a new translation, and presently gave order for THIS TRANSLATION, which is now presented unto thee." But what further proves, that the complaints against the English versions were groundless, that it really was an "empty shift," a mere shallow pretence of the Non-conformists, who only condemned them, as Doctor Milner knows, after their objects in other points were defeated, is this; that they neither collectively nor individually attempted to supersede the versions then extant by one of their own: nor have those, who succeeded them, *to this day*, supplied, or attempted to supply, the place of our existing version, although the passages at first objected to, have continued in it *without alteration*. In fact, the attempts at a new one, which have been made from other quarters, have been uniformly unsuccessful, and have consequently added to the reputation of this our standard English version of 1611.

That the Puritans, when driven to the last extremity, put in a plea for certain alterations

in the Communion Book, and that pitiful as it was, it led to our present English version of the Bible, is here conceded ; but that they raised an outcry in the way spoken of by Doctor Milner, is contradicted by the very nature of the thing, and by the principle on which they acted. These sectaries, as their name imports, affected greater *purity* in the service of God, than, they allege, * “ is set forth in the Book of Common Prayer ;” and carried on their hostility against the rights and usages of the Romish Church, farther than was consistent with the moderation of the Church of England. It is therefore conceivable enough, why Doctor Milner should feel anxious to conceal the name of *Puritan* under that of Protestant, by which the members of the Church of England are now exclusively designated ; but it is difficult to conjecture, why he should say generally, that there was an outcry among the most learned Protestants, against the English Bibles, unless he expected, that his readers would be of such a class as would receive every thing he said, without further inquiry, as the truth itself. When it is admitted, therefore, that the Puritans in King James’s time, cavilled at certain passages in the then received English version of the Bible ; it must, at the same time, be remem-

* Heylin’s Hist. p. 356.

bered, that *no bishop, no king*, was their * motto; and that consistently with the levelling principle, which such a motto indicated, their objections, originating as they must have done, in fanatic zeal, were little likely to impeach the accuracy of the Authorized Translation; still less, to sanction those advanced by Popish cavillers. Had our Authorized Translation, indeed, been a negligent or an ill-executed one, there would no doubt, have been an outcry raised against it by learned Protestants; nor could it possibly have maintained the high character it has done for two centuries, amidst the numerous religious parties which have sprung up within that period. But, as those parties have never substituted a new one in its place, and as the attempts of individuals have always failed, we may conclude, that nothing can more clearly demonstrate its purity and excellence. Moreover, although various motives may have of late years urged the different denominations of Dissenters to unite in affording it the most general and wide-spread circulation, when not impelled to do so by any partiality for the Church which gave it birth; yet, we may be certain, that a sincere admiration of its excel-

* During the discussion at Hampton Court, King James observed, that “if the *Bishops were out*, and the *Puritans in*, he knew what would become of his supremacy.”—SHEPHERD’S Introd. to Com. Prayer, p. lxxv.

lence was a leading one. It is, therefore, not going too far to say, that not only the members of the Church of England, but those, who have detached themselves from it, regard this version of God's Word as an invaluable possession, and that the veneration for it is universal.

We shall now find the case reversed, when we consider the *outcry*, which Doctor Milner says existed "among learned (Roman) Catholics." On this point, I most cordially acquiesce with him. There are numerous testimonies to prove, that *they* were incensed beyond measure at every attempt, which had been made to supply the people with the Scriptures in their mother tongue. Thus, Tonstall, Bishop of Durham and Sir Thomas More, are said to have been * "*sore aggrieved*" at Tyndal's translation of the New Testament being published; to have purchased as many copies of it as they could procure, and to have them burnt at St. Paul's Cross. The former complained that he found no less than 2000 corruptions in the first English Bible; and Bishop Bedell observes, that the latter also *pretended* to have discovered errors in Tyndal's New Testament: for † "that there he found and noted wrong, and falsely translated, above a thousand texts by tale." But

* STRYPE's Cranmer, Book i. ch. 21.

† BURNET's Life of Bishop Bedell, p. 386.

the Bishop afterwards assigns the true cause for this pretended discovery of faults; inasmuch as * “men,” (*scil.* the Popish Bishops), “were loth these books should be read. The substance of them was such as could not be controlled. The next remedy was to forestal the readers’ minds with a prejudice of *falsification*, that so they might not regard them, but cast them out of their hands of their own accord.” When Tyndal’s New Testament was brought into England, the Popish clergy were highly enraged; some said † “that it was not possible to translate the Scriptures into English; some that it was *not lawful* for the laity to have them in their *mother* tongue; and some, that it would make them all *heretics*, and produce rebellion.” ‡ Lewis, speaking of the English translation of the Bible directed to be made by King Henry the Eighth, in 1542, says, “that it was certainly the greatest *eye-sore* to the Popish party, and that which they knew would most effectually beat down all their projects. But there was no opposing it directly, for the king was fully resolved to have it. Therefore, the way they took was this; they loaded the translation with as many faults as they could, and complained

* *IBID.*

† BISHOP WATSON’S Coll. of Tracts, vol. iii. p. 70.

‡ HISTORY of the English Translations of the Bible, pp. 328, 335.

of it as being *very erroneous and heretical*. They likewise represented to the king, the allowing the people the free use of it, was a means of increasing faction and parties, and destroying the peace of the kingdom; that the common people disputed of the Scriptures, and quarrelled about them in taverns, and ale-houses, calling one another papist and heretic." The same historian informs us, that Archbishop Parker was more successful in effecting an English translation of the Bible, than his predecessor Cranmer. * "The Popish party," says he, "having done their utmost to *argue* and *force* the Protestants out of their religion, and nothing able to gain their end, they had recourse to jest and ridicule."

Both † Johnson and ‡ Lewis represent Bishop Gardiner to be no less severe in his censures on the English versions, than Doctor Milner is at the present day; and that when his anger was assuaged, he was content to propose a list of words amounting to *ninety-nine* in number, which he had collected from the New Testament, alleging, that || "they should on account

* IBID.

† HISTORY of the Translations of the Bible by Anthony Johnson.

‡ *Ut supra*.

|| Viz. *Ecclesia, Pænitentia, Pontifex, Conflictationes, parabola, panis propositionis, zizania, olocausta, idolum, apostolatus, pascha, &c.*

of the majesty of the matter signified by them, either be left untranslated, or Englished with as little variation as possible." And, on the appearance of our received English version, we find the *outcry* thus raised, kept up with unabated violence. Johnson relates, * "that the Romanists *much excepted* hereat; (viz. the translation of 1611). Was their translation, say they, good before? Why do they now mend it? Was it not good? Why was it obtruded on the people?" Again, he says, "besides this, the Papists *take exception*; because in our new translation, the various senses of the words are set in the margin; this they conceive a shaking of the Scriptures, such variations being as suckers to be pruned off, because they rob the stock of the text of its due credit and reputation." We shall find a still later period disgraced by the † coarsest invective against, and most vulgar abuse of, our Authorized Translation of the Scriptures, in what is pompously styled, the Errata of the Protestant Bible; and which ‡ Doctor Milner dignifies with the title of Mr. Ward's learned Polyglott. In verse too, this his favourite author, vents his rage in his

* WATSON'S Coll., vol. ii. p. 97.

† For instances, see PREFACE to my ANSWER to Ward's Errata of the Protestant Bible, p. xvii.

‡ See his INQUIRY into certain vulgar opinions, pp. 337, 341.

* Satire on the Reformation, in the following way :

In short, this *last* translation still
Is *false, corrupt*, almost as ill
As those crooked rules of faith they had
In days of Elizabeth and Ned.

It would be an endless task to enumerate the instances of Popish abuse and calumny, which have been heaped on our received Translation, written or verbal, from Ward's time to the present day ; all which would go to prove, that the spirit of rancorous opposition, which was given to the blessed work of our Reformers at the outset, and which was continued to their successors, has not yet died away. Indeed, when we call to recollection the tragical end of Tyndal, who, after encountering all the evils of poverty, exile, and imprisonment, was strangled and burnt ; as well as the various dangers attendant on the first attempts of other learned men to effect an English Translation of the Scriptures ; when, at an earlier period, we find the Church of Rome wreaking its vengeance on the very bones of Wickliff, for the same reason ; and when we connect with all this, the eternal † sameness of Popery and its boasted unchange-

* WARD's Reformation, Canto iv. p. 87.

† "*Semper eadem* is more emphatically descriptive of our religion than our jurisprudence."—PLOWDEN's Case Stated.

ableness; should we be surprised at the virulence with which our English Bible is assailed by the Romish clergy of the present day? When, therefore, Doctor Milner affirms, that the *Roman Catholics* raised an *outcry* against the early English versions of the Bible in use, on the accession of King James I., I entirely concur with him in opinion, from the evidence adduced.

But, says Doctor Milner, the King himself "*joined in the outcry*, and accordingly ordered a new English version of the Bible to be made." We shall presently see how far this is true by reverting to the subject of the conference at Hampton Court. I should first observe, that Doctor Milner makes no express mention of this conference, when he speaks of the outcry; but that he evidently alludes to it, may be collected from its connexion with the subjects of which he treats, as well as from the arguments he uses in his other publications. For, in his Inquiry into certain vulgar opinions respecting Ireland, he introduces Ward as saying, * "that when the growing sect of Puritans began to turn these corruptions, (alluding to certain texts in the Bibles of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth), against the members of the Church

DOCTOR TROY also says, "The religious opinions of Roman Catholics being *unchangeable*, are applicable to all times."—Pastoral Letter, Dublin, 1793.

* Page 342.

of England, particularly at the famous conference of Hampton Court, in the beginning of the First James's reign; at last you thought proper to correct them." * I have already shewn, that the conference was not held as Ward and Doctor Milner would lead a person to suppose, for the discussion of biblical corruptions; but for matters which related to the doctrine and discipline of the church: that the subject of a new translation of the Bible was no more than introduced; and that the mention of it seemed to arise from accident, rather than from design. And as to the general censure, which Barlow reports King James to have thrown on the English translations of the Bible then extant, when Doctor Reinolds moved his Majesty, that there might be a new one made; a little explanation will divest it of the severity which Doctor Milner attaches to it. On the representation being made, his Majesty expressed a wish, † "that some especiall paines should be taken in that behalf for *one uniform translation*; professing, that he could never yet see a Bible well translated in English; but the worst of all his Majesty thought the Geneva to be." Now, in order that the King should pre-

* See page 79.

† Sum and Substance of the Hampton-Court Conference, p. 46.

serve consistency, between what he is reported to have said respecting the English versions of the Bible, and the FIRST and FOURTEENTH of the rules laid down for the learned men, whom he appointed to execute a new translation ; the expression “ *well* translated in English,” can only be supposed to mean, that he had never yet seen an English Bible, in which there were not passages capable of being *better* translated. A reference to the rules themselves will prove this. For, the FIRST of them, according to *Burnet, directs, that “the Bishops’ Bible *be followed*; and as little altered as the truth of the original will permit;” while the FOURTEENTH prescribes, “that the following translations be used, when they agree better with the text, than with the BISHOPS’ BIBLE.” viz.

† TYNDAL’S,

MATTHEW’S,

COVERDALE’S,

WHITCHURCH’S, better known by the name of Archbishop Cranmer’s, or the Great Bible; and

THE GENEVA.

And, when the king pronounced the Geneva Bible, which had been translated by the English refugee Calvinists resident in that city the

* HISTORY of the Reform., vol. ii. Part ii. p. 369.

† IBID.

worst of all; it appears, that political causes, which were totally unconnected with its merits as a translation, induced him to say so. His Majesty contended, that some of the notes annexed to the Geneva Bible were **“very partial, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous and traitorous conceits;”* and supported his opinion from the marginal note, “Exodus, i. 19, which *alloweth disobedience to the king;*” and from the marginal note, “2 Chronicles, xv. 16, which *taxeth* Asa for deposing his mother only, and *not killing her.*” His Majesty only contended publicly against the notes of the Geneva version. But, that he became better informed about its true character, is evident, from his having pointed it out to the new translators as one to be followed. What their opinion of it was, and the comparative estimation in which they held even it, contrasted with the Douay Bible, I have already had occasion to state.

I have thus disposed of the royal censure in all its bearings, and trust I have shewn, that His Majesty did not consider even the worst English Bible that he had ever seen, in the way described by Doctor Milner. On the whole, therefore, I conclude, as the King’s instructions

* SUM AND SUBSTANCE, ut supra, pp. 47, 48.

were, that the Translators should use the above-named six versions, but particularly Archbishop Parker's, commonly called the Bishops' Bible; that His Majesty no more censured the English versions then extant, than he joined in an "*outcry*," (which, except among the Popish party, did not exist,) under the idea of their being "*notoriously corrupt*."

The general charge, therefore, against our Authorized Translation of the Bible being now disproved; we next proceed to consider the nature of the particular one preferred against it by Doctor Milner.

This Gentleman says, * "though these new translators have corrected many wilful errors of their predecessors, most of which have been levelled at (Roman) Catholic doctrines and discipline; yet they have left a sufficient number of these behind; for which, I do not find, that their advocates offer any excuse." For these errors, he refers to the *learned Gregory Martin's Treatise* on the subject, and to *Mr. Ward's Errata of the Protestant Bible*. It is strange, that he defends generally the criticisms of the latter, although some of the texts which he vindicated, stand altered in the last published Douay edition of the Old Testament; and it is still more strange, that he should approve of

* LETTER ix. p. 72.

them, for no other reason, than because of the virulence with which they are drawn up. But, to what a low and degraded state must biblical criticism be reduced in the Romish Church, when Doctor Milner, one of its most learned divines, sets up two such men and their miserable performances, in opposition to the united talent and learning of Protestant Europe since the Reformation? For, according to him, all the *errors* which they have pointed out remain uncorrected in our Bibles to this day, for which no excuse has been offered! And yet, at the moment he utters those words, he alludes to the late Doctor Ryan's ANALYSIS of the Errata, and makes express mention of the ANSWER I sent forth in counteraction of Ward's misrepresentations, as containing *something* more than an excuse. Doctor Ryan's Review of Popish cavils is decisive to the extent it goes; and with respect to my own Answer to Ward, were I to say, that I only palliated errors, instead of repelling charges, I should, as one of the humblest advocates of our English versions, thereby admit the justice of Doctor Milner's imputation. But, I will say more, and I trust, the readers of my Answer will credit the truth of the assertion, that my publication, comprising as it does the ablest arguments of our most learned divines, contains a full and victorious refutation of pernicious error; and that I have success-

fully established the superior merit of our standard English text, no less than its fidelity to the original, in the passages criticised. In their hands I rest my cause, while I join issue with Doctor Milner respecting the vindication I have given of two passages in particular; the one relating to the celibacy of the clergy, and the other to the doctrine of Communion under one kind, which, on the authority of Martin and Ward, he reproduces as erroneously translated in our English Bible.

The passages, to which I allude, are 1 Cor. xi. 27, and Matt. xix. 11. These very ones he has spoken of in his *Inquiry as “still disfiguring” the Protestant Bible. In his present †publication, he says, that “though these corruptions stand in direct opposition to the original, as the Rev. Mr. Grier and Doctor Ryan themselves quote it, yet these writers have the confidence to deny, that they are corruptions; because they pretend to prove from other texts, that *the cup is necessary*, and that *continency is not necessary*.” In my ANSWER, I have, as I conceive, satisfactorily proved, that the rendering of *ἡ παντὶς χερσὶ*, Matt. xix. 11, is perfectly correct in our Authorized Version of the Bible; as being most agreeable to the original, as well as to the sense in which SS. Augustine and

Jerome understood it. I have there been obliged to convict Doctor Milner of gross ignorance of the Greek, no less than of a fraudulent application of the Latin language, in which he is so deeply versed; and have proved to demonstration, that the Rhemish version of this very text, as well as of *εἰ δὲ ἢ ἐγκρατεύονται*, 1 Cor. vii. 9, which he considers of “such importance towards settling the disputes concerning the *possibility* of leading a continent life” is erroneous. Should the reader refer to the *pages of my Answer pointed out below, I entreat him to notice, whether I have expressly, or by implication, said, or pretended to prove, *that continency is not necessary*. In truth, the abstract question, whether the continency of the clergy was, or was not necessary, was but a secondary object with me; my chief design being to shew, that an ordinance respecting their celibacy, was rather of human, than of divine institution. But, as I have devoted a separate †chapter to this subject, I shall not now further enlarge on it.

As to the text, 1 Cor. xi. 27, on which the Romish church grounds its sacrilegious practice of suppressing half the Eucharist, the reader will find it also amply treated of in a subsequent ‡chapter. To the Protestant interpretation of both texts, Popish writers, it is true,

* Pages 33, 55, and 92.

† xx.

‡ Viz. vii.

have, from the period of the Reformation to the present time, made objections; but these are futile, and few, compared to the solid reasons which exist for our preserving them unaltered. As bearing on this point, I may be allowed to relate an anecdote told of Doctor Kilbie, one of the venerable translators of our Bible. * “ Doctor Kilbie and Mr. Sanderson going together to that parish-church where they were, found the young preacher to have no more discretion, than to waste his time in *exceptions* against the late translation of several words, (not expecting such a hearer as Doctor Kilbie) and shewed *three* reasons, why a particular word should have been otherwise translated. When evening-prayer was ended, the preacher was invited to the Doctor’s friend’s house, where, after some other conference, the Doctor told him, he might have preached more useful doctrine, and not have filled his auditors’ ears with *needless exceptions* against the late translation; and for that word, for which he offered to that poor congregation *three reasons* why it ought to have been translated as he said, he and others had considered all of them, and found THIRTEEN more considerable reasons why it was translated as now printed.” To Doctor Milner I leave the application of the

* WATSON’S Coll. vol. iii. p. 98.

foregoing anecdote ; for it certainly affords an useful hint to a self-confident critic.

If we now direct our attention from the consideration of those few words to which our adversaries object, as being erroneously translated, to the merit of our Translation itself ; we shall find, that for the three critics, viz. Gregory Martin, Thomas Ward, and Doctor Milner, who have heaped on it every species of vituperation and abuse ; not merely *three*, but, I might almost say, *three hundred* of the soundest divines, and most profoundly learned biblical scholars might be enumerated, who have admired it for its general faithfulness, the severe beauty of its language, and the simplicity of its style ; and have pronounced it one of the grandest efforts of human skill and industry. That they are borne out in the high encomiums they have passed on it, will appear, if we but advert to the peculiarly happy circumstances, under which it was executed ;—the flourishing state of the Hebrew, and the wholesome vigour at which the English language had at the time arrived. Every prudent and wise precaution was taken, in employing the most learned men of the day, and in laying down strict rules for their observance ; and, as the same may be said with respect to those who prepared the version, which immediately preceded it, the circumstance of our last English Bible being a revision

thus derived, is an advantage in itself of the greatest value. In short, executed as it was, when the English language was, as I have already observed, fresh in its native simplicity and vigour, it will ever be esteemed as classical, and regarded with awful respect.

Among the eminent literary characters who have given their attestations in favour of our Authorized Translation of the Bible, the following appear conspicuous. Their high authority compel us to believe, that it is a faithful version of the original text, and that one more perfect, every thing considered, is neither necessary, nor expedient. Most of them are to be found in Archbishop Newcome's and Mr. Todd's lists; and, although Sir James B. Burges has attempted, in his Reply to the latter gentleman's vindication of our received English Bible, to throw discredit on many of the authorities here referred to, because of the deistical Geddes, as the worthy baronet styles him, being associated with them; yet Mr. Todd may rest secure from censure for having cited Geddes, since the Archbishop did not hesitate to quote his opinion on the merits of our translation, much as he disapproved of his religious principles.

1. AS to SELDEN's testimony, * I have already had occasion to advert to it, when re-

* See page 75.

selling Doctor Milner's attack on the Bishops' Bible. He speaks in high terms of the process adopted by the translators in forming our received version; and surely, his opinion of the result of that process ought to have great weight. In one place, he says, that * "there is no book *so translated* as the Bible," and, in † another, "that the last English translation is *the best* in the world."

2. ‡ FULLER, after censuring the cavils, which were raised against our English Bible, as not being furnished with the notes of the Geneva one, commends the translators in these paraphrased words of Scripture. "Wheresoever the Bible shall be preached or read in the whole world, there shall also this, that they have done, be told in memorial of them."

3. || WALTON says, in the Prolegomena to his Polyglott Bible, "that among the European translations of the Scriptures, King James's one (*eminet*) stands conspicuous." And again, in his § Defence of his Polyglott, he affirms,

* TABLE TALK, sect. ii. p. 2009. † IBID, p. 5.

‡ Church History, Book x. p. 59, *not cited* by Archbishop Newcome.

|| "In omnes fere Europæ linguas hodie eloquia sacra tracta sunt - - - - - inter omnes vero *eminet* Anglicana Jacobi Regis auspiciis multorum virorum doctorum studiis elaborata."—PROLEGOM., p. 5.

§ CONSIDERATOR considered, Preface, p. 5.

“ that the last English translation made by diverse learned men in 1611, may *justly contend* with any now extant in *any other* language of Europe.” It will hardly be expected, that Walton, after expressing himself in this decided manner respecting the King’s Bible, intended to say, that the church of Rome was exclusively the *true* church of Christ; inasmuch as it has denounced as heretical and corrupt this very version of the Scriptures which he extols; yet, strange as it may appear, he is made to do so; since Doctor Milner quotes him to this effect, in the following passage. * “The word of God does not consist in mere letters, whether written or printed, but in the true sense of it, which no one can interpret better than the *true* church, to which Christ committed this sacred deposit.” But, that this Protestant Prelate did not solely mean the church of Rome, when he spoke of the *true* church, appears no less from this extract, than from his general reasoning.

4. † LIGHTFOOT remarks, “ with what sweetness and harmony the New Testament doth follow *this Translation*, sometimes even besides the letter of the Old, to shew that HE that gave

* IBID. p. 34.

† MISCELLANIES, Christian and Judaical, p. 65.

the Old, may and can best expound it in the New."

5. * POLE, in the Preface to his Synopsis, acknowledges the greatest obligations to our English Bible, for the aid which it afforded him in his critical labours, and speaks of it as possessing the highest merit.

6. † Pocock, Hebrew Professor at Oxford, in 1676, says, "that we deservedly follow that translation of our own, it being such and so agreeable to the original, that we might well choose among others to do so, were it not our own, and established by authority among us."

7. ‡ LOWTH esteemed the English translation of the Bible, "*the best standard of our language.*"

8. || SWIFT says, "that no translation our country ever yet produced, hath come up to that of the Old and New Testament."

9. § MONBODDO's testimony is similar to that of Lowth.

* "In qua plurima occurrunt *magnæ eruditionis peritiæque* in linguis originariis - - - - - quæque mihi haud raro in difficillimis textibus *maximo erat adjumento et usui.*"—Page 5.

† PREFACE to a Commentary on the Prophet Micah.

‡ Introduction to English Grammar, p. 93.

|| PROPOSAL for improving the English Tongue, vol. iv. p. 48.

§ ORIGIN and PROGRESS of Language, vol. ii. p. 141.

10. * DURELL, after observing that our English translation is *closer* to the original than any preceding one, as being *free* from the affectation of sublimity, no less than vulgarity of expression, remarks, “that it preserves a due medium between the Geneva and Roman versions, equally avoiding, on the one hand, the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who prefer their new terms, such as *washing*, and *congregations* to the old ecclesiastical ones, *baptism*, and *church*; and on the other hand, the obscurity of the Papists, in not translating such words as *azyme*, *holocaust*, *pasche*, &c.”

11. † GEDDES speaking of the high estimation, in which the translation of James I. is held both at home and abroad, says, “if accuracy, fidelity, and the strictest attention to the letter of the text, be supposed to constitute the qualities of an excellent version, this of all versions must be accounted *the most excellent*.”

12. ‡ GRAY considered it one of unrivalled excellence. He calls it “a *most wonderful and incomparable work*, equally remarkable for *the general fidelity* of its construction, and *the magnificent simplicity* of its language.”

13. § Professor White says “as the style of

* CRITICAL REMARKS ON Job, Pref. p. 6.

† PROSPECTUS of a new Translation, p. 92.

‡ KEY to the Old Testament, Introd. p. 43.

§ SERMONS, pp. 8, 9. Ed. 1779.

the vulgar translation is not only excellent in itself, but has taken possession of our ear, to have endeavoured to vary from it, with no other design than that of giving something new instead of it, would be to disgust the reader."

14, 15, 16. *BISHOP BAGOT, †WESLEY, and ‡WAKEFIELD, speak of our authorised translation in the highest terms of commendation; although writers of opposite characters and denominations.

17. § WATERLAND says, " it is with a just veneration to the memory of our learned and judicious translators, that I acknowledge their version in the main to be *faithful*, clear, and solid."

18. || Rennell observes, " that our received version exhibits *a more perfect* specimen of the integrity of the English language, than any other writing which that language can boast." And " that the industry, the learning, and abilities, which have been sedulously exerted in collecting the mistakes and inaccuracies said to exist in it, have *scarcely been able* to produce a single error, by which any material fact or doctrine is affected."

19. ¶ MIDDLETON speaks of the style of our present version as being " simple, harmonious,

* CHARGE, p. 33.

† TRANSL. of the N. T., Pref. p. 5.

‡ Pref. to N. T., p. 4. § See NEWCOME's Hist. View, p. 296.

|| DISCOURSE, ix.

¶ ESSAY on the Greek Article, p. 32.

and energetic ; and which is of no small importance, use has made it familiar, and time has rendered it sacred."

20. * KNOX contends, " that our present translation should be retained in our churches, for its intrinsic beauty and excellence. The poetical passages of Scripture are peculiarly pleasing. The language, though it is simple and natural, is rich and expressive."

21. † ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME, notwithstanding his prejudices in favour of an *improved version* of the Scriptures, observes, " that that now in use leaves nothing necessary to salvation in doubt or uncertainty. And that *no* translation, even of a single book, has yet appeared preferable on the whole to the received one."

22. ‡ Mr. Whitaker has enhanced the value of his testimony in its favour, by having sunk beyond the possibility of recovery Mr. Belamy's *new version* in the estimation of the learned. He thus expresses himself, " Our authorized version of the Bible may be compared with any translation in the world *without fear* of inferiority ; it has not shrunk from the most rigorous examination, *it challenges* investigation, and in spite of numerous attempts to

* ESSAYS, Literary and Moral, No. XLIX.

† HIST. VIEW, p. 296.

‡ HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL ENQUIRY, pp. 93, 94.

supersede it, has hitherto remained *unrivalled* in the affections of the country.”

I shall content myself with adding the testimonies of two other distinguished Divines—BISHOPS HORSLEY and MAGEE. The former, in the Preface to his translation of the Prophet Hosea, modestly says, “ I desire, that it may be distinctly understood, that I give my translation, *not as one that ought to supersede* the use of the public translation in the service of the church.” And the latter of those learned Prelates has presented us with such a mass of invaluable criticism on a * new translation of the Book of Job, and such incontestable proofs of its erroneousness, that our regard for our standard version, which great learning, attested by the seal of episcopal authority, was calculated to chill ; has been quickened into affection. Bishop Stock, the author of the new translation of that ancient book, unwisely produced it as one, which ought to supersede the translation in public use. I say *unwisely*, because he acted, in this instance, so unlike the learned Horsley ; and because had he not put forward his translation, with such vain pretensions to superiority, it might have slept in harmless repose, and have escaped the critical acu-

* The Book of Job, newly translated by the RIGHT REV. J. STOCK, BISHOP OF KILLALA.

men, which explored its unsoundness. The Bishop of Raphoe, thus finally dismisses his subject with saying, * “that, in his opinion, the necessity for a new English version of the Book of Job (if any be supposed previously to have existed) has *in no particular* been diminished by that, which has been given to the world by the Bishop of Killala.”

Were it necessary to add any thing to evidence so irresistible, I should speak of the estimation, in which our Authorized Translation of the Bible has been held by all sects, who have forsaken our church; and that when church and state were overthrown, and the established religion underwent the most rancorous persecution, it survived the general convulsion, and met with universal respect from all parties. Of late too, the strongest testimony in its favour has been manifested by every denomination of Protestants in their desire to give it the greatest publicity and most wide-spread circulation.

Lastly. If the reader will only contrast the foregoing attestations, with the puny efforts which have been made to impeach its fidelity; he will have no less reason to admire this glorious work, than the talents and integrity of those who consummated it. He will have additional reason to bless God, that he has been

* See DISCOURSES ON the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice, vol. ii. pp. 132, 199.

rescued from the horrors of Papal darkness and superstition, by their labours, as well as by those of their immediate predecessors ; and that a direct communication has been laid open between him and the divine fountain of truth itself. For, to use the strong and appropriate language of our translators ; * “ how shall men meditate in that which they cannot understand ? How shall they understand that, which is kept close in an unknown tongue ? ” Then, after proclaiming the triumph they obtained through their labours over their Popish adversaries, they thus conclude :—“ Translation it is, that openeth the window to let in the light ; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel ; that putteth aside the curtaine, that we may looke into the most holy place ; and that remooveth the cover of the well, that wee may come by the water.”

* PREFACE OF EPISTLE to the Reader, Transl. 1611,

CHAPTER V.

THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION — A
PAPAL NOVELTY.

THE doctrine of Transubstantiation, like every other innovation in the church, was gradual in its growth and progress from its earliest rise, until its final adoption. It was not heard of before the year 787, at the second Council of Nice; when it was originally introduced. The period in which it was first proposed in set terms was peculiarly favourable to its reception. When newly invented rites, and superstitious ceremonies increased in number, and assumed so much consequence as to throw the vital doctrines of Christianity into the shade; it was natural, that the merit and importance of those few simple rites, which could without difficulty be traced to our Saviour's commands, should be extolled in the most extravagant terms. Language, which, if applied to recent institutions, might not have been listened to, was received with so much the greater satisfaction; because, if it elevated the dignity of those holy mysteries, it contributed, at the same time, to exalt the character of the priesthood. The

opinion entertained about Transubstantiation was conceived to be so powerful an engine for effecting this purpose, that when once set on foot, it could not but be favourably received by all those, who sought every possible pretext to advance their credit and authority. The consequence was, that the artifice employed for this purpose, became ultimately successful, for, as they blasphemously expressed it—*what was impossible* for those to do, who could, by uttering a few words, make God? And, as one error generally produces another; the error in faith, that the consecrated bread and wine were literally the body and blood of Christ, led to the error in practice, of worshipping them as such. The clergy also were so numerous, and their contrivances so well suited to the credulity of the age, that they easily imposed on the weak and ignorant multitude. Besides, the prevailing taste of those times was that of pomp and pageantry; and having lost the beauty of religion, they wished to compensate for the defect by outward shew and ceremony.

Such was the state of things in the eighth century, at which time the sentiments of Christians concerning the *nature* of Christ's presence in the sacrament were various and contradictory: neither Bishop nor Council having previously determined that important point. But in the beginning of the next century, the doc-

trine of the church on this head appeared to assume a settled shape, at the hands of * Paschasius Radbert, who, at least, affected to explain it with precision, if not decide on it with certainty. This view of the subject varies little from that taken of it by the late † Bishop Porteus, the present ‡ Bishop of Winchester, and by other writers, who have preceded them on the same ground. So that were Doctor Milner to make good his charge against these modern bishops, as he styles them, on the score of *ignorance*, it would lie with equal force against Usher, Claude, Burnet, and others of equal eminence, as shall be now shewn.

Thus, to begin with § Usher. He maintains, “that Paschasius was *one of the first setters forward* of this doctrine in the west,” and grounds his assertion on antecedent authorities, to which he refers. || Claude observes, “that that monk proposes his opinion in the way of paradox, as if he were about to say something extraordinary and surprising by the words, *et ut mirabilius loquar*, &c.; yet he never vaunted, that his doctrine was that of the church,

* See MOSH. Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 340.

† COMPUTATION of the Errors of the Church of Rome, p. 35.

‡ ELEM. of THEOL., vol. ii. p. 450.

§ ESSAY on the Real Presence, p. 50.

|| DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST, Book vi. pp. 214, 224. Ed. 1654.

and frankly acknowledges, that, *before his time*, men were *ignorant* of it." * Burnet affirms, that antecedent to the year 754 of the Christian era, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper "was not considered to be any thing else, than the *figure* or *image* of Christ's body." Mosheim's testimony has the same bearing, and, according to Doctor Milner, his evidence, as being that of a fair historian, is admissible. And even † Sirmond the Jesuit, in his life of Radbert, relates, "that this monk was the *first*, who explained the genuine sense of the Catholic church in this mystery." I might enlarge this catalogue by the names of ‡ Bramhall, Laud, Andrews, &c. &c. By such high authorities, are Bishops Porteus and Tomline borne out in what they say respecting Radbert being the *first writer* who started this doctrine; and yet are they exclaimed against by Doctor Milner, as if no historical record of what they relate were in existence. It is truly tender in him, no doubt, to express his apprehensions, lest the character of the Church of England for ecclesiastical literature should suffer throughout Europe, should it be said, "that such positions respecting Radbert, had been published by one or two of its most celebrated Prelates." But let me speak peace to the gentle Doctor's

* ARTICLE XXVIII.

† VITA Pasch. Radbert.

‡ See CHAP. vi. in loc.

fears on this head, as those Prelates ground their statements not only on the positive evidence of those to whom I have referred ; but on the negative evidence to be derived from the silence of the ancient fathers, councils, and historians on the subject ; and unless he confines knowledge, as he does salvation, to those of his own communion, he must admit, that the most learned Protestant Divines of the present day have, like them, declared Transubstantiation to be of *modern* invention, a *novelty*, and a *heterodoxy* of the Church of Rome.

Transubstantiation has always constituted the leading point of controversy, as being that which forms the chief difference between the Churches of England and Rome. It is that which recurs every day in the Romish Church. Most of its other doctrines are not indispensable in their operation ; but, an attendance at mass, said as it is *daily* at every altar, is enjoined, if not enforced, as a regular part of devotion : while the celebration of it is esteemed one of the most prominent acts of the Popish clergy. As, therefore, our denial of Transubstantiation is the chief heresy, which they object to us, so it is against their faith and practice respecting this important tenet, that we enter our most solemn protest ; because, that next to its doctrine of infallibility, it is what the Church of Rome most highly values ; as

constituting the sublimest part of its worship, and the chief subject of its devotions; as interesting in a greater degree both clergy and laity in its support, than any other; and as being more the object of their study, and for which they so confidently appeal to the primitive fathers and to the Scriptures.

The Church of Rome has declared, by more than one solemn act, that, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the bread and wine are so changed into the body and blood of Christ, that their substance is wholly annihilated; that the accidents or species, (i. e. the *appearances*,) of those elements alone remain, and that their substance is *the very body and blood of Christ*, even that very body which *suffered* upon the cross. When Berenger was forced to retract his heretical opinions respecting the Eucharist, the doctrine of Christ's corporal presence in the sacrament was first pronounced an article of faith, in a council held at Rome by Pope Nicholas II., A. D. 1059; but was not generally acknowledged as such by the Church. This council declared, that after the consecration of the bread and wine, the *true* body and blood of Christ were in reality, and according to the testimony of the senses (*sensualiter*), * “*handled by the priests, and broken and crushed by the*

* *Sacerdotum manibus, tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri.*—GRATIAN. De Consecrat. Dist. ii. c. 42.

teeth of the faithful." This doctrine was subsequently asserted with greater effect, by the *fourth council of Lateran, A. D. 1216, which set forth, that † "the bread is *transubstantiated* into the body, and the wine into the blood of Christ;" thus preserving a distinction between the bread and wine, and the body and blood. The council of Florence, in 1439, added, ‡ "that the *whole* Christ is contained under the species of the bread, and the *whole* under the species of wine; and that *in every particle* of the consecrated wafer, and of the consecrated wine, whenever a separation takes place, there is *the whole Christ.*" But its final confirmation was reserved for the famous council of Trent in the sixteenth century, which unequivocally affirms, § "that in the blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ is *truly, really,*

* "In this council," says GIBBON, "Innocent III. may boast of the two most signal triumphs over sense and humanity: the establishment of *Transubstantiation*, and the origin of the *inquisition.*"—DECLINE AND FALL, vol. ii. p. 152.

† "Transubstantiatis pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem potestate divinâ."—CABASSUT. Hist. Concil.

‡ "Sub *quâlibet* quoque *parte* hostiæ consecratæ, et vini consecrati, separatione factâ, *totus* est Christus."—BINNI Concil., tom. v. pars i. p. 614.

§ "Dom. N. I. C. *vere, realiter, ac substantialiter*, sub specie illarum rerum *sensibilium* contineri."—IBID.

and *substantially* contained under the appearances (*species*), or accidents of the *sensible* things." It further declares, * "that the *whole* substance of the bread is converted into the body, and the *whole* substance of the wine into the blood of Christ; and that the most holy Sacrament is to be honoured with the highest degree of worship, even that expressed by LATRIA;" and † "that it is *not the less* to be adored for having been instituted by our Lord in order to be taken." All this doctrine is enjoined by the council, under the penalty of the accustomed anathemas, as its ‡ Canons shew.

So much for the doctrine of Transubstantiation and its consequents, as laid down by the council of Trent. To them are opposed the official declarations of the Church of England; I speak of its xxviiith, xxixth, xxxth, and xxxist Articles. On comparing those docu-

* "Per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri *totius* substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi, D. N. et *totius* substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus."—IBID.

† "Neque ideo minus est adorandum, quod fuerit a Christo Domino ut sumatur institutum."—IBID.

‡ CANON I.

"If any one shall deny, that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is *truly, really, and substantially* contained the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, *together with his soul and divinity*, and consequently the *whole* Christ;

ments with each other, it will be at once perceived, that although both churches agree about Christ's real presence in the Sacrament; yet that they possess a different idea of that presence. In fact, the great dispute between them relates to the *nature* of it. They say, that Christ is present *substantially*; after the manner of a body: we maintain, that He is only *spiritually* present. Neither of us can, therefore, use the words REAL PRESENCE as descriptive of our differences, or of our peculiar opinions, without further illustration; unless through

but shall say, that he is in it only as in a sign or by a figure, or virtually; LET HIM BE ACCURSED."

CANON II.

Or; "that the substance of the bread and wine *remains together* with the body and blood of Christ, or that a miraculous conversion of them takes place;" ANATHEMA.

CANON III.

Or; "that the *whole* Christ is contained under *each* specie, and under every individual particle of each specie;" ANATHEMA.

CANON IV.

Or; "that in the particles consecrated, which are reserved after the communion, the true body of our Lord does not remain;" ANATHEMA.

The *sixth* Canon enforces the *worship* and *procession* of the host; and the *eighth* denounces those who say, that Christ is eaten after a *spiritual* manner, and not really.

ignorance, or with an intention to deceive. But, as I resume this subject in the next Chapter, I shall, for the present, pursue it no farther.

It is not possible, either that Doctor Milner believes it himself, or expects that others should believe, that the divines of the Church of England have recourse to **“disingenuous artifice”* whenever they discuss the subject of the Eucharist; because he must be conscious, that nothing distinguishes them so much from their adversaries, as candour and fair dealing. If they use stronger language in condemning those unscriptural doctrines of the Romish Church, which he enumerates; namely, those relating to “the veneration of saints, pious images, indulgences, and purgatory,” than what they apply to similar conundrums of that church: they are neither guilty of *falsehood*, nor do they betray a *malevolent* spirit towards their Roman Catholic brethren: inasmuch as they only express what they are bound to do:—the sentiments of the church, to which they belong, on these points. In proof of this, if we refer to our LITURGY, ARTICLES, and HOMILIES, we shall find, that they contain more emphatic terms than any we use in our ordinary writings against the usages and doctrines of the Church of Rome:

* LETTER xxxvi. p. 39.

such as *anti-christian, heretical, idolatrous*. They condemn “the *fond things vainly invented*” by that church, which are as “*repugnant* to the word of God, as they are to Christ’s ordinance and commandment.” They censure its “*blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits*,” and accuse it of “arrogance and impiety.” By our ordination vows, upon the faith of which we have been received into the ministry of the church, it becomes our bounden duty * “to be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all *erroneous* and *strange* doctrines *contrary* to God’s word ;” and, if in the fulfilment of those vows, we manifest a feeling correspondent to the importance of our obligations, due allowances should be made. Zeal, and the warmth of our language, should be ascribed to the proper motive, and never be said to originate in *malevolence* towards our Roman Catholic brethren.

Dr. Milner’s next accusation is, that we misrepresent Roman Catholics, † “as worshippers of bread and wine, in the sacrament, and therefore as idolaters ;” at the same time that we are aware, that they firmly believe, “that there is *no bread, nor wine* ; but Christ alone, true God as well as man, present in it.” He then adds,

* ORDERING OF PRIESTS.

† LETTER XXXVI. p. 39.

“granting that we are mistaken in this belief, *the worst we could be charged with is an error*, in supposing Christ to be where he is not; and nothing but *uncharitable calumny* could accuse us of the heinous crime of idolatry.” His illustration of this point is very remarkable. * “Let us suppose,” says he, “that being charged with a loyal address to the sovereign, you presented it by mistake to one of his courtiers, or even to an inanimate figure of him, which for some reason or other had been dressed up in royal robes, and placed on the throne, would your heart reproach you, or would any sensible person reproach you with the guilt of treason in this case?”

It is much to be lamented, that a gentleman like Dr. Milner, who possesses such a versatility of talent, so much learning and such acute observation on every other subject, should appear to betray symptoms of an impaired intellect in religious concerns alone. He affords a convincing proof to what a low ebb a man's reason may be degraded, whose mind is overcast by the mists of superstition. I should wish to know, from him, what similitude exists between his error, in supposing a courtier, or an inanimate figure decked out in the robes of royalty, to be

* LETTER xxxvi. p. 40.

the sovereign, and in consequence of that supposition, in his presenting either of them with an address intended for the sovereign himself; and a solemn act of religious worship? There can be no resemblance discovered between a solitary mistake produced by a person's agitation in the bustle of a court, and the regular and systematic observance of a rite deliberately adopted, and pertinaciously defended, during a succession of ages. Besides, no two things can be more unlike, than homage, or civil worship, to man, and adoration to God. But, let us suppose, that the person charged with the address, after having been made personally acquainted with his sovereign, and his own duty as a subject, and further told that the sovereign was jealous about the honour and respect due to him; should his subject, I say, after this, still persevere in paying the courtier, or the senseless statue in the niche, the homage due to the other; could he, in such a case, plead ignorance as his excuse, or exculpate himself from the suspicion, if not from the charge of disloyalty? When Sysigambis, the Queen of Darius, fell at the feet of Hephæstion, whom she mistook for Alexander, she was not by that one error guilty of treason. So, neither were the people, who, while *in doubt, probably wor-

* "And all men *mused* in their hearts of John, whether he

shipped John the Baptist as Christ, to be considered as idolaters, in consequence of their mistake. One overt act committed in this way will not constitute an offence of the kind ; but a deliberate and determined repetition of it, after it had been forbidden. So, with regard to such a sin as idolatry, a man's misconception of it, may with a merciful God, who is slow to anger, and ready to pardon, operate in his favour ; but it never can make that innocent, which is in itself sinful.

But, observes Doctor Milner, "our adversaries are perfectly aware, that we believe as an article of faith, that there is *no* bread nor wine, but Christ alone, true God, and true man," present in the sacrament. By this, he means, that the members of his church inwardly worship no creature, and pay divine adoration

were the Christ, or not."—LUKE, iii. 15. The REV. MR. LE MESURIER exposed this plea when urged by Mr. Fletcher, in his *Remarks* on the Bishop of Durham's GROUNDS of separation from the Church of Rome. Harding, the Jesuit, at the time of the Reformation, relied on a more curious instance, in his controversy with Bishop Jewell, viz. "that Jacob was not guilty of adultery, when he was put to bed to Leah, thinking her to be Rachel."—See JEWELL'S REPLY, p. 305. It is admitted, that Jacob was imposed on ; would Doctor Milner, therefore, allow, that the people are equally deluded in the celebration of the mass ? However, we see, that every illustration, argument, or remark used by him, has had its parallel in some of the antiquated works of former controvertists.

only, as they conceive, to God. But, how can the sincerity of their belief, that the bread and wine are *really* God, lessen the idolatry; inasmuch as it is in the error of the belief, as well as in the falsehood of the doctrine, that idolatry consists? Were sincerity of belief a palliation, it is such as the ignorant Egyptian might urge, since he is as firmly persuaded about the divinity of the crocodile, as the Roman Catholic is respecting his breadden God.

Besides, on Doctor Milner's principle, no reason can be assigned for any external sign, or act of worship; nor had the Almighty any reason for attaching such importance to acts and signs, as we find He has done in his law; nor for directing that they should only be exhibited in honour of Himself; nor for his issuing the second commandment. All these considerations are thrown aside by the Doctor, as if the adoration of the bread and wine in the Eucharist was only an act of the mind, and that bowing down before them was not idolatry in the *outward* act. Bellarmine declares, * "that adoration belongs even to the *symbols* of bread and wine, as being one with Christ whom they contain." Another writer of the same class ob-

* Adorationem ad *symbola* etiam panis et vini pertinere.—
DE EUCH. lib. iv. c. 29.

serves, * “that the council of Trent does not say, that the Sacrament is to be adored with **Latria**, but Christ in the Sacrament.” And a third, † “that not only Christ, but the whole *visible* Sacrament must be adored by one and the same worship; because it is one consisting of Christ and the *species*.” Thus, on their own shewing, the **LATRIA**, which is the highest possible worship, is offered to the *external* and *visible*, as well as to the internal part of the Sacrament. The propriety of this is defended by Bellarmine, on the ground, ‡ “that they who adored Christ when on earth, adored not only Himself, but after a certain manner, the *garments* which He wore.” It cannot here escape notice, that Bellarmine’s argument proves too much; for, according to it, the || wise men must have been justified in worshipping the very clothes in which he was wrapped, as well as the child **JESUS** Himself when lying in the

* Non dicit Concil. Triden. Sacramentum, sed Christum in Sacramento, **LATRIA** adorandum.—**ST. CLARA** de Grat. p. 308.

† Non solum Christum, sed totum *visibile* Sacramentum, unico cultu adorari, quia est unum constans ex Christo et *speciebus*.—**SUAREZ** in Theol. Quest. 79.

‡ Qui Christum in terris vestitum adorabant, non ipsum solum, sed *etiam vestes quodam modo adorabant*.—**DE EUCH, VENERAT.**

|| See that invaluable Repository of Popish confutation,—the **PRESERVATIVE AGAINST POPERY**, Tit. vii. c. v. p. 342.

manger. The people must have been so too, in worshipping the *ass*, on which Christ rode, as well as Christ Himself; not, to be sure, on account of the animal, but of the burthen which he bore!! The sentiments of those expositors, and the reasonableness of the worship, had been, about the same time, officially declared by the council of Trent (*sess.* 13,) with the usual ANATHEMA against those, who thought or spoke differently. If, therefore, we only bear in mind, that idolatry is the believing that to be God, and bowing down to that as God, which is not God; we must be convinced, that neither firmness of persuasion, nor sincerity of belief, can extenuate the idolatry of such worship; and that, whether the bread and wine be worshipped as God, or God be worshipped under the form of bread and wine; it is as much a violation of God's commandment to bow down to an image of bread, as it is to one of brass or wood.

“The *worst*” we can be charged with, says Doctor Milner, is “only *an error*,” in supposing Christ to be where he is not. Might not the idolatrous Jews, who worshipped the molten calf have excused themselves in the same way? By such worship, they did not intend to withdraw their allegiance from the true God, who brought them out of the land of Egypt; nor did they conceive the gold, which they adored, to be

God, as the * feast appointed to the Lord testifies. The same thing may be said of the Manichæans, who adored the † sun and moon, although Christ was the declared object of their worship. These visionaries absurdly supposed, that Christ had placed his tabernacle in the sun, and that what appeared to be the sun, was not so in reality. But, to go a step farther, is it not such a plea as the Heathens might urge, and such as their philosophers have often urged? Even the anti-christian Celsus apologizes for the idolatrous Egyptians on the same ground; that they did not worship their brute creatures but only as they were ‡ *symbols* of God. As, therefore, the Jews conceived, that after Aaron's consecration of the golden calf, the accidents or species of the gold alone remained, while the substance of it was annihilated, and that under those, God Himself was present; and, as the Manichæans wildly imagined, that the body of the sun had been converted into Christ's glorious body; and lastly, as the unenlightened Pagans have taken their idols for the Gods themselves: will, I say, their misconceptions have excused their idolatry? According to Doctor Milner's reasoning, they all stand wide

* EXOD. xxxii. 5.

† Solem etiam et Lunam adorant.—AUGUST. Epist. 94, ad Deuter.

‡ Είναι αὐτὰ καὶ θεὰ σύμβολα.—ORIG. contra Cels. lib. iii.

of this great offence; but the Heathens most of all, because, apparently, most in error.

At the worst we are only in error. But, what will Doctor Milner say, should any of those things, which the church of Rome esteems essential, be absent; the mere want of which would nullify the consecration? A variety of causes may contribute to this end; such as the bread not being of a proper kind; nor properly made; or the wine sour; or the forgetfulness of the priest to consecrate the bread and wine; or the consecration being unduly performed; or the absence of the priest's intention; or, should the intention be right, but that through inadvertence, he consecrated suppose thirty, instead of twenty wafers prepared for the purpose; or that he distrusts his power to transubstantiate; then there is no consecration: but that which is adored is a little bread or wine. Again, should the priest not have been regularly baptized or ordained; to ascertain which, it would be necessary to trace the priestly office from him to every other priest, through whom it descended, up to the apostolic age. Even a single link in the chain being wanted, or the least defect in these particulars, according to the principles of the Church of Rome, as it affects the consecration, leaves the elements of the bread and wine unchanged. Should a man of common sense, therefore, run a risk in a matter

of such importance, and which depends on such extreme contingencies? Where there is so much uncertainty, the goodness of the intention cannot be taken into account, except it can at the same time be said, that it will not only excuse what Doctor Milner may probably suppose to be an error; but what may possibly, on his own principle, be an heinous sin—that of paying adoration to the mere elements. For he himself admits, that if the doctrine of Transubstantiation be false, the members of the Church of Rome are in that case the greatest idolaters.

Doctor Milner has so contrived to mix up political with polemical matter, in the discussion of every subject, that it is often difficult to decide, in what character he wishes to be considered; whether in that of the politician, or of the religious disputant. This is particularly the case in the present instance. But, as I deprecate political warfare, I shall barely offer a passing remark, that nothing can be more uncandid, nor untrue, than that the charge of idolatry, which he says has been “vociferated by Bishop Porteus and Protestant writers in general against his brethren, is perpetuated by the legislature, *for the purpose* of defeating their civil claims.” Because, it is not on account of their belief in Transubstantiation, which is only a speculative error; nor on account of their

adoration of the host, which is the practical result of that error, that Roman Catholics are subject to disabilities; but because, as I have *elsewhere observed, they divide their allegiance between their rightful Sovereign and a foreign Ecclesiastic.

Among those Protestant Prelates, who, unlike Bishop Porteus, and other *illiberals* of his stamp, have acquitted Roman Catholics of the charge of idolatry, Dr. Milner mentions the learned GUNNING, Bishop of Ely, and JEREMY TAYLOR, Bishop of Down: the former, he says, reprobated the *Declaration* against Popery when it was brought into the House of Lords, † “protesting, that his conscience would not permit him to make it.” Here Doctor Milner tells the truth, but not the *whole* truth; for, although Gunning at first maintained, that the Church of Rome was not idolatrous, his subsequent conduct shewed, that he thought it so: because, as Burnet tells us, ‡ “after the law was passed for the Test against Popery to be taken by both Houses, in which, not only Transubstantiation was renounced, but the worship of the Virgin Mary; *he took it in the crowd with the rest*, though he scrupled at first.” Thus, instead

* See PREFACE.

† LETTER xxxvi. p. 41.

‡ HISTORY of his own Times, vol. i. p. 246.

of vindicating Roman Catholics from the charge of idolatry, Bishop Gunning seals his conviction with the solemn sanction of an oath, * “that in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ and that the sacrifice of the mass, as it is now used in the Church of Rome, is *superstitious* and *idolatrous*.” † Gunning is further stated to have been ‡ “a very honest and sincere man,” and, like the Reverend Mr. Wix of the present day, intent on reconciling the Church of England to Popery in some points. But enough has been said to enable us to appreciate the value of his support to Dr. Milner’s cause.

Never was authority more misapplied than Bishop Taylor’s; for when he appears to vindicate Roman Catholics from the charge of idolatry, he does so from motives different from those ascribed to him by Dr. Milner. After

* For DECLARATION against Popery, see BURN’S Eccl. Law, vol. iii. p. 151.

† According to both Wheatly and Shepherd, Bishop Gunning was considered the author of the Prayer—“*For all conditions of men;*” at least, in St. John’s College, Cambridge, to which he belonged. I mention this as an additional proof, that his prejudices were not of the complexion represented by Dr. Milner.

‡ BURNET’S Hist., ut supra, p. 102.

speaking of the pertinacity, with which they fasten the name of heretic and schismatic on all who disagree with them, he remarks, * “that in no sect of men do they with more ease and cheapness reconcile a wicked life with the hopes of heaven, than in the Roman communion.” Then, having contrasted Transubstantiation with their other doctrines, he says, “*it is harder to be judged of; if false, as upon much evidence we believe it is, then is it accused of idolatry.*” And again, “*they have done violence to all philosophy and the reason of man, and undone and cancelled the principles of two or three sciences to bring in this article of Transubstantiation.*” On the words, “THIS IS MY BODY, WHICH IS BROKEN, &c. he thus comments, † “we are to understand them in a sense *not natural*, but *spiritual*, that is, *truly sacramental*; and all this is besides the plain demonstrations of sense the natural sense not only being *unreasonable* and *impossible*, but to no purpose of the spirit, or any way perfective of the soul.” After this view of that Prelate’s sentiments, how can it be said that he acquitted Roman Catholics of the charge of idolatry, and yet accused them of perverting a

* See LIBERTY OF PROPHECYING, sect. xx. pp. 357—359, 366, et seq.

† DISSUASIVE from Popery, pp. 36, 39, 46, et passim.

text in Scripture, and of violating reason by the introduction of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which produces the occasion of that charge; except by supposing, that while he was convinced of the erroneousness and absurdity of their faith, he still, through a charitable motive, gave them credit for the sincerity of their professions?

But, to return to his Liberty of Prophesying. From this work of the celebrated Bishop of Down, Dr. Milner derives an argument, which, as shall be presently shewn, imparts to his cause but imaginary support, and, as far as I can see, by no means acquits Roman Catholics of the charge of idolatry. I give the Bishop's words, as cited by him:—* “The object of their adoration in the Sacrament is the only true and eternal God, hypostatically united with his holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the veil of the Sacrament. And if they thought him not present, they are so far from worshipping the bread, that *they profess it idolatry to do so*. This is demonstration, that the soul has *nothing* in it, that is *idolatrical*; the will has nothing in it but what is a *great enemy to idolatry*.” It is admitted, that the Bishop made this declaration; but he afterwards, like Bishop Gunning, re-

* LIBERTY OF PROPH. sect. xx. p. 366.

tracted it with derision and contempt, and thereby proved, that he viewed the doctrine of Transubstantiation in the same light with all those, who considered it absolute idolatry. His desire was to secure *toleration* to the persons of the Roman Catholics; and although he wished that their doctrine should be discountenanced “by all means, human and divine,” yet he contended, that they themselves “should be TOLERATED *eatenus*, because, by their good lives, they confute their doctrines.” But, to effect this, he defended their belief in Transubstantiation with fictitious arguments, which he called “*wooden daggers*, intended to represent how the poor men are cozened by themselves.”

It has been the fate of Jeremy Taylor to be held forth by Roman Catholics as being favourable to their tenets, from the moment he published his *Liberty of Prophesying* to the present day. Both a Popish manual and catechism, which now lie before me, proclaim this Protestant Bishop as a supporter of Transubstantiation, while his advocacy is more than once relied on by Doctor Milner to the same effect. But never was authority more shamefully misrepresented; because, if he pleaded for *toleration*, he did not palliate *error*. This most distinctly appears in his *DISSUASIVE* from Popery; in the *PREFACE* of which work he says, “I did not intend to make that harangue to re-

present, that the Roman religion had probabilities of being true, but *probabilities* that the religion might be tolerated." He afterwards adds, "but now, in my conscience, this was unkindly done; that when I had spoken for them what I could, that they should take the arms that I had *lent* them for their defence, and *throw them* at my head. But the best of it is, that the weapons themselves are *wooden daggers*, intended to represent how poor men are cozened by themselves. And though what I have said was but *tinsel* and *pretence*, *imagery* and *whipt cream*, yet I could not be blamed, to use no better than the *best* their cause would bear; yet, if that be the best they have to say for themselves, their *probabilities* will be soon overbalanced by *one* Scripture testimony urged by Protestants; and thou shalt not worship any graven images, will *outweigh* all the best and fairest imaginations of their Church." When the reader considers, that too much of this great and learned Prelate's sentiments cannot be known, particularly when they are contradictory to his former opinions, on which Popish writers so eagerly fasten, he will the more readily excuse so long and interesting an extract as the preceding.

Were it necessary to add another word in proof, that the support which he gave this question was hollow,—mere empty bravado; I might refer to the way in which he argued: E. G.

They profess it to be idolatry, says he, to worship the bread; *ergo*, the soul has nothing in it that is idolatrical! Weak as this argument is, it is the *best*, as he says himself, that he could advance, or that their cause would bear. And certainly he is not to be charged with the insufficiency of an argument, which he afterwards disclaimed. But, as if to put it beyond doubt, that he thought the doctrine false, and the worshipping the bread and wine idolatrous, he thus expresses himself,—*“ We know idolatry is a damnable sin, and we also know that the Roman Church, with all the *artifices* she could use, *never can* justify herself, or *acquit* the common practices from idolatry.” Which is to say, that the practices of the Church of Rome, notwithstanding all its contrivances to disguise and envelope it’s doctrine, partake of the guilt of idolatry. In truth, by once admitting that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is false, he discloses his real sentiments; while he dissipates into air the phantom of defence he set up for it by his pretended rhetoric.

To Thorndyke’s opinion I attach but little importance, for the † reasons already stated. But even his authority is misrepresented by Doctor Milner; and although he asks, ‡“ will

* IBID.

† SEE PREFACE.

‡ JUST WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, c. xix. p. 147.

any Papist acknowledge, that he honours the elements of the Eucharist? will common sense charge him with honouring that in the Sacrament which he does not believe to be there?"—yet his subsequent * explanation shews, as Bishop Taylor's did in his own case, that, although he had peculiar ideas on the subject, they were very *different* from those ascribed to him.

If Bishop Cosin be not held forth as an apologist for Popish idolatry, he is at least represented as maintaining, † "that Christ is really and *substantially* present in the Eucharist." I disjoin the words, "by an incomprehensible mystery," from the preceding sentence, because Doctor Milner esteems them of no force; although, in my mind, they qualify the *nature* and *manner*, in which the Bishop conceived Christ to be present in the Sacrament. But, instead of dissenting from the Church of England, he fully expresses her sentiments on this important point. For, after stating the benefits of a worthy reception, and observing that the elements are by the power of God raised to a higher dignity in the Sacrament than their nature bears, he goes on to say, ‡ "but that Christ, as the Papists affirm, should give his flesh and

* See PRESERVATIVE AGAINST POPERY, vol. ii. Tit. vii. p. 322.

† HIST. OF TRANSUB., p. 44.

‡ *IBID.* p. 56.

blood, to be received with the mouth and ground with the teeth, so that not only the most wicked and infidels, but even rats and mice should swallow him down, *this our words and hearts do utterly deny.*" Immediately after, he says, "*we deny* that we may avoid *all ambiguity*, that after the words of prayer and consecration, *that the bread should remain bread no longer*, but should be changed into Christ's Body." He then concludes with pronouncing the Roman doctrine, "*so strange and monstrous*, that it exceeds the nature of all miracles." From the extracts here adduced, it may be seen, how unfairly Doctor Milner has acted in torturing a solitary passage from that Prelate's writings into the Popish acceptance, with utter disregard to his general reasoning. But this is not all; for, as if he had convinced his reader that the Bishop was an advocate for the *corporeal* presence, he thus artfully connects his name with the doctrine in question. * "*Transubstantiation*," says he, "*according to Bishop Cosin, was the first of Christ's miracles, in changing water into wine; so it may be said to have been his last, during his mortal course, by changing bread and wine into his sacred body and blood.*" The antithesis, no doubt, is lively and ingenious; but I see no analogy between the miracle performed

* LETTER XXXVI. p. 44.

at the marriage feast, which was attested by the evidence of the senses, and one given out as such on the authority of the Romish Church. For, as *Tertullian remarks, that which *first* tasted like water, *after* the miracle was performed, tasted like *wine*. But can this be said of the sacramental wafer? The contrivance, however, is not always without its use; although, in the present instance, it has not escaped detection.

* “Fidelis et *gustus* vini illius, licet aquæ *ante* in nuptiis Galilææ; fidelis et tactus exinde creduli Thomæ.”—*De Anima*, c. xviii.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE
SACRAMENT.

A COMPARISON of the first four * Canons of the Council of Trent, with the corresponding Articles of our Church, will satisfy the reader, that both Churches agree, that Christ is *present* in the Sacrament, and that they only differ about the *nature* of that presence. When, therefore, Doctor Milner, in speaking of our differences, uses the words REAL PRESENCE as expressive of the opinion of the Church of Rome without further explanation, his object cannot be mistaken. He is perfectly sensible, that Transubstantiation and Real Presence, in the Popish sense, imply the *same* thing, and that if he only used the former term, he would avoid the ambiguities and equivocations, to which the use of the latter phrase gives rise. He, therefore, shrewdly keeps that word, which points out the subject of dispute, in the back ground. Transubstantiation is a term indicative of its own

* See pages 116, 117.

meaning. In the judgment of the Trent Fathers, it is clear, appropriate, and what should render it unobjectionable to him, it is purely of Popish origin; he should consequently adopt it. Protestants believe Christ to be really present in the Sacrament, because they believe in his ubiquity; but ubiquity is not Transubstantiation.

I would here ask Doctor Milner, what the Church of England has to do with the doctrine of Consubstantiation, or the errors and extravagancies of Luther, which he so unnecessarily introduces into this discussion? His adjurations of devils, his exorcisms, and the like, to which Luther had been habituated when a member of the Church of Rome, naturally betrayed him into the grossest absurdities, after he had withdrawn from its communion. These fooleries make nothing for Doctor Milner's argument; while the stress he lays on them betrays the weakness of his cause. Neither is the coarse and vulgar language, which that Reformer applied to those, who denied the corporeal presence, and of which Doctor Milner has so industriously given us * specimens, imputable to us. And if, in the heat of controversy, he compared the glosses of Zuinglius,

* Such as *a damned sect, lying heretics, soul-destroyers, &c. &c.*
LETTER xxxvii. p. 53.

to his own blasphemous parody on the * first verse of Genesis ; the Church of England, purified as it is to the perfection of its apostolic model, is in no respect accountable for such indiscretion and violence. We do not repose our faith on Luther ; nor do we, to use Doctor Milner's courteous and conciliating language, esteem him the father of our *pretended* Reformation. It was not he, who founded our Church ; as its foundation was partly laid before his time. In fact, the grounds of its separation from the Church of Rome existed long antecedent to that memorable era.

Doctor Milner next alleges the alterations, which have been made in our Liturgy in the course of a century, as a proof, that our Church has varied in its sentiments respecting the corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist. We shall now see how this matter stands. The Church of England maintained the *same* opinion on this subject during the above period ; but her governing members were obliged to yield to circumstances, over which they had no control. It is granted, that our first Liturgy in 1548, *expressed*, as might naturally be expected, the *Popish idea* of the real presence. But in

* In principio Deus creavit cælum et terram.—In the beginning *the cuckoo eat the sparrow and his feathers!*—Defens. Verb. Dom.

its next revision in 1552, a Rubric was added, expressly **denying* this tenet. Queen Elizabeth, however, who had not yet imbibed the pure spirit of Christianity, which had guided her youthful Predecessor, and the venerable Cranmer, expunged it in 1559; † “her design being to unite the nation in *one* faith.” The contrivance had the desired effect, as the Popish laity continued in connexion with the Church of England for ‡ ten years, and only broke off when she refused to acknowledge the Pope’s Supremacy. In 1661, after the Restoration, the old antipopish Rubric of King Edward’s second book was *restored*, and holds its place in our Liturgy *without alteration* to this day. These stages mark the successive improvements which it received; and although I mention but a variation on the point alluded to by Doctor Milner, yet I may add, that each subsequent revision brought the whole of it nearer to that state of perfection, for which we now so justly admire it.

* See SHEPHERD’S Introd. to Com. P. p. lxiii., and BISHOP TOMLINE’S Theol. Elem., vol. ii. pp. 25, 26.

† BURNET’S Hist. of the Reform., vol. ii. part ii. p. 390.

‡ Bp. Taylor says, “from *primo* of Elizabeth to *undecimo*, the Papists made no scruple of coming to our churches; recusancy was then not so much as a *chrysome*, not an *embryo*. But when Pius Quintus sent forth his *Breves* of excommunication and deposition of the Queen, then first they forebore to pray with us, or to have *any* religious communion.”—FIFTH OF NOVEMBER Sermon, p. 22.

Doctor Milner next * argues, that the Established Church itself appears to hold the *real presence*, since it declares in its authorized catechism, “that the Body and Blood of Christ are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper.” Here again is the equivocal use of the words *real presence*; equivocal, I say, as they imply a sense which we admit, as well as another, which we reject. We acknowledge, that Christ is *spiritually* present to the true believer; but we deny that he is present in any bodily, transubstantiated shape. To say, therefore, that we receive in *truth* and in *fact* in the Sacrament, what we acknowledge to be there after a *spiritual* manner, is to speak conformably to the sound doctrine of our church. Moreover, were Christ present in a bodily shape; *unbelievers* as well as the “faithful” would be partakers of his Sacrament. But our xxixth Article declares, that “such as be void of a lively faith, in *no wise* are partakers of Christ.” Here the Article interprets the language of the catechism; while it completely overturns Doctor Milner’s argument.

† “We maintain,” says the venerable Bishop of Durham, “that to eat Christ is an act of the mind; of faith, not of the Body; and that what

* LETTER xxxvii. p. 44.

† SERMONS by Shute, Bp. of Durham, p. 422.

is done spiritually is done *verily*.” Or as Secker expresses it, * “we firmly believe the union with Christ, to be not only represented, but *really* and spiritually communicated to the worthy receiver.” To the eye of faith, Christ’s real presence is disclosed, and in this light we consider it. But this will not satisfy our Popish adversaries, unless we believe what contradicts the testimony of our senses, our reason, and the Scriptures themselves. We must not only believe, as we do, the *real presence* of what is not visible to the eye of the body ; but we must even believe the *real absence* of what we see, touch, taste, and smell. Jeremy Taylor remarks † “that Christ’s Body is in the Sacrament *really*, but spiritually. The Papists say the same. Where now is the difference? Here; by spiritually they mean present after the *manner* of a Spirit; by spiritually, we mean present to our spirits only: that is, so as Christ is not present to *any other sense*, but that of faith or spiritual susception.” Again, “Christ is *no way* present in the Sacrament as to his human nature; he is present there by his divine power, &c., but for any other presence it is *idolum*, it is nothing in the world.” I refer the more willingly to Bishop Taylor, because of the gross misapplication, which Doctor Milner has made of his autho-

* SERMONS, vol. vi. p. 84.

† See PRESERV. against Popery, vol. ii. Tit. vii. p. 321.

rity, as I have shewn in the preceding * chapter. Let it henceforth not be forgotten, that he considered the *Popish* real presence as a figment, a *non-ens*, a mere *idolum*.

After this exposition of the antepenultimate answer of our church catechism, I should be glad to know, how it involves a contradiction to say, that *verily* and *indeed* refer to a spiritual, rather than to a corporeal participation of the Sacrament, when the word *faithful* most emphatically makes it to be of that nature. Doctor Milner has, however, discovered a direct variance, which he thus illustrates: † “ You receive,” says he, “ that in the Sacrament, which does not exist in it; it is like the speech of a debtor, who should say to his creditor, I hereby *verily* and *indeed* pay you the money I owe you, but I have not *verily* and *indeed* the money wherewith to pay you.” As far as I can perceive, there is no discoverable analogy between the two cases, and I question much, but this was Doctor Milner’s own opinion, when he had recourse to this fanciful illustration. If he have gratified himself by playing off his wit, he has done so at the expense of his judgment. Now for the proof of this. When, in obedience to Christ’s commands, I receive the blessed Sacrament of his Body and Blood, I do so because

* See p. 131—135.

† LETTER XXXVII. p. 45.

he orders it; I claim no merit for the performance of the act; nor do I set any value on it: on the contrary, I conceive it to be my "bounden duty and service," and I am fully sensible, that after my utmost efforts to please God, I am still an "unprofitable servant." How, therefore, can it be said of me, that *I pay* my kind creditor a debt, when according to my own acknowledgment, the return I make is of *no* estimation? Let us now view Doctor Milner in the light of the debtor, and see, whether the language, which he has applied to the members of the Church of England, be not strictly applicable to himself. Is he, or is he not, one of those who contend, that the mere receiving of the Lord's Supper procures a remission of sins *ex opere operato*, as it were mechanically? Does he not set a value on the performance of the work; on, I say, the *opus operatum*; on the mere observance of Christ's command? If I can form any opinion of the estimate of human merit in the Church of Rome, all this is critically the case. As, therefore, Doctor Milner can *thus* cancel the obligation, which he owes his heavenly creditor, he may very consistently address him after this manner. 'I hereby *verily* and *indeed* pay you the debt I owe you;' and he may with as much propriety add, 'but I have not *verily* and *indeed* that, wherewith to pay you!'

Doctor Milner lays great stress on the miracle of the loaves, as recorded by St. John, vi. 13.; because Christ fed the multitude, who followed him. This, he insists, is an “evident sign of the future multiplication of his own person, on the several altars of the world.” But did not Christ bid the multitude to * “labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth to eternal life?” And again, † “my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.” Now were the Sacrament implied by these words, or were they to be understood literally, we must conclude, not that bread was converted into Christ’s Body, but his Body into the bread. So that the whole passage appears but a figurative mode of pointing out that those benefits, which the soul derives from his death, are much more valuable than what the body receives from its daily food. I should add that although Doctor Milner gives the sacramental construction to the viith chapter of John, ‡ Popish writers may be adduced, who reject it and apparently for good reasons; because if interpreted directly of the Eucharist, it would furnish one strong argument *for* Infant Communion, which their church has discontinued, and

* JOHN, vi. 27.

† IUD. vi. 32.

‡ VIZ. BIEL, CUSANUS, TAPPER, HESSELIUS, and JANSENIUS, say that the viith of John *does not* relate to the Eucharist.

another *against* the denial of the Cup to the Laity, which it maintains.

At the Institution of the Eucharist, our Saviour expressly said, THIS IS MY BODY; and THIS IS MY BLOOD. The question then is, in what sense, and after what manner, must the bread and wine be conceived to be his Body and Blood. Doctor Milner says, * “that the native evidence of those texts goes to establish the literal meaning.” Well; the original Greek is *τὸ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου*, and if he be correct in what he says, the *τὸ ἐστὶ* must refer to what is contained under the species of the bread. Not to say, that grammar forbids this application of the pronoun demonstrative; it is highly absurd to affirm that it can be thus applied. For, what is contained *under* the species, or accidents of bread, must refer either to the bread itself, or to the Body, or to the species. It would not exactly suit him to admit that it referred to the bread. *τὸ ἐστὶ* does not refer to the Body; for it would be supposing that present, which is not yet present: as he himself admits, that the change in the bread does not take place, until after the consecration. Nor can *τὸ ἐστὶ* refer to the species; because, until there be such a conversion, they continue in the bread and are one with it. It may therefore, be reasonably

* LETTER XXXVII. p. 45.

asked, what *that* thing is, which *τετο* expresses, which is neither bread, nor body, nor accidents? In the embarrassment in which this subject formerly involved Popish Controvertists, * Bishop Jewell relates the curious expedient to which they had recourse for the purpose of extricating themselves. They said, that it referred to some *individuum vagum*, some creature of the brain, which they could not tell ! But the difficulty will be avoided by taking *τετο* as it stands in the proposition, *This is my Body* in a determinate sense. Let it be resolved thus. *This*, namely this thing, referring to the bread, which Christ was before said to have taken, blessed, and broke. *Body* properly refers to Christ's Body. Therefore, the copula, to speak logically, which unites two things of such opposite natures as *bread* and the *Body* of Christ, must necessarily have the force of to *signify* or to *represent*: for they themselves admit that *disparatum de disparato non proprie predicatur*. Therefore, Christ must have spoken *figuratively*, when he called the bread his Body, they being disparates, and consequently, of opposite natures. Hence the words, “*This is my Body*,” imply, ‘*This represents my Body* :’ as this *is* Cæsar, ‘*this represents Cæsar*.’ But, besides, this

* REPLY to Harding, Art. 24. See also PRESERV. AGAINST POP. Tit. vii. ch. iv. p. 259, and LE MESUR. Euch. pp. 59, 60.

exposition is perfectly accordant to the genius of the Syro-Chaldaic, the language spoken by our Saviour. In that language, there is no term expressive of *to mean, to denote, to signify*; and therefore, the Jews always say **it is*, instead of it *signifies*.

We perceive the Jewish idiom frequently occurring in the Scriptures; as † “the seed *is* the word,” ‡ “I *am* the door,” § “I *am* the true vine,” || “the seven kine *are* seven years,” and ¶ “it *is* the Lord’s Passover,” Here we may observe that the eating of the paschal lamb is metonymically called the *Passover*. Doctor Milner, it is true, admits that the paschal lamb, was “a mere figure, and an incitement to faith;” yet, because there are not as heavy denunciations against the profaners of it, as against the unworthy communicants of the Lord’s Supper, he therefore infers, that this was in consequence of Christ being present in the Eucharist; whereas he was only represented by the paschal lamb in the Passover. But he should at the same time recollect, that were the Jews commanded to drink wine at the Passover, there would no

* The REV. Mr. WARNER’s Chronolog. Hist. of our Lord Jesus Christ, Ed. 1819, and ABP. USHER’s Discourse on the Religion of the Ancient Irish, p. 38, will be advantageously consulted on this subject.

† LUKE, viii. 11.

‡ JOHN, x. 7.

§ IBID. xv. 1.

|| GEN. xli. 26.

¶ EXOD. xii. 11.

doubt have been as heavy denunciations uttered against drunkenness, or any other profanation of that Sacred Feast, as were against indecency of conduct, or unworthy communication at the Table of the Lord.

But further, if we only consider the nature of the festival among the Jews; of what it was commemorative; and to what it was in every particular allusive; and next the nature of the Institution, which was to supersede it, we must conclude, that our Saviour designed, and that the Apostles understood it to have a *typical* signification. As Jews, they knew well, of what the eucharistical sacrifice of the lamb, and the cup of blessing were typical, and must necessarily have understood our Saviour's expression, when he called the bread his Body, nay, his Body *broken*, at the moment he was present with them, as typical also. But, besides, can it be supposed, that the Apostles, who were slow to comprehend difficult things, and forward to ask questions, understood our Saviour to have taken his own Body, into his own hand, and then to have distributed that very Body to each of the twelve at the same time; and that each of them believed, that he bruised his Master's Body with his teeth, and swallowed him, although sitting at the table with them at the same time? The supposition is monstrous and unnatural. Most cordially do I agree with

Doctor Milner, that our Saviour did not intend to deceive his Apostles, when he instituted the Sacrament, and was on the point of leaving them, and bequeathing them the legacy of his love. For, * “He who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth,” could not practise deception. We must be perfectly convinced, that He only designed by this ceremony, that they should remember Him, and His Body broken for them; as they had, by a corresponding one, before that time, remembered the † bread of affliction, which their Fathers eat in Egypt. This analogy of the Eucharist to the Passover, was noticed long before the Reformation by the Jews themselves. They objected to the literal interpretation of the words as being contrary to the intention of our blessed Lord; no less than to the belief of His Apostles, who were well versed in the paschal forms. While on the other hand ‡ St. Austin observes, that the phrase, THIS IS MY BODY, is the same as if we were to say, this is Christmas day; or Good Friday; or Easter day: not that they were the *very* days which they express; but that they were the *return* or *remembrance* of them.

* 1 PETER, ii. 22.

† DEUT. xvi. 3. See PRESERV. against Popery, vol. ii. c. iv. p. 306, and Abp. Secker’s Sermons, vol. vi. p. 82.

‡ EPIST. xxiii. ad Bonifac., Oper. vol. ii. p. 29.

In the preceding chapter, I have shewn on what grounds the *origin* of Transubstantiation is ascribed to the ninth century, and the *first* mention of it to Paschase Radbert. With respect to those writers, who followed up the idea of the bodily presence in the Sacrament, in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, their authority, although relied on by Doctor Milner, is to be disregarded, as no other sources of information were open to them, than those which we now possess. But as he appeals to the early fathers to prove its existence in the primitive ages of the Church, I am contented to let the question be decided by those of his own selection, after having premised a few general observations.

It is remarkable, that although the fathers are, generally speaking, unanimous, respecting those doctrines which are held in common by the Churches of England and Rome, such as those of the Trinity, the Atonement, &c. ; yet, that the points about which they differ, are the *very ones*, about which those Churches are not agreed ; but that, as to the doctrine of the corporeal presence in the Sacrament, they had no thought of it at the time. There is no doubt, that they use very forcible language, and apparently speak in direct terms of it ; but this is not irreconcilable with the original application of their words in a figurative sense. Because, as they have

all admitted the figurative meaning of the words, TAKE, EAT; THIS IS MY BODY; their reasoning on them, in this sense, might proceed to an indefinite length. They might amplify their expressions to any extent on this principle, although in language applicable to the *actual* eating of Christ's Body. When it has been once admitted, that Christ's words have a metaphorical bearing, it entirely does away the idea, that they can be afterwards understood in a literal sense. It is the very property of a figure, that things are spoken of, as being *different* from what they are. Thus, when a father calls the sacramental bread and wine, *a type* or *representation* of Christ's Body or Blood; to make him consistent with himself, we must consider him, when he again makes mention of Christ's Body and Blood, to mean, that they are only there *typically*, or *figuratively*. In other words, if he, like the Roman Catholics, believed, that the *natural* Body and Blood of Christ were *really* in the Sacrament, he could never again consistently call the Bread and Wine, the *symbols* of Christ's Body and Blood.

I must premise too, that of the ancient fathers, to whose writings Doctor Milner directs my attention; some lived in the very infancy of the Church, and had either known our Lord Himself, or conversed with his Apostles. It, therefore, cannot be supposed, that such men should

be unacquainted with the true interpretation of Scripture. Of this description of persons is Ignatius, one of the apostolic fathers, to whose authority Doctor Milner makes his first appeal.

1. IGNATIUS, speaking of certain heretics of the day, remarks, * “ that they do not admit of Eucharists and *oblations*, because they do not believe the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, who suffered for our sins.” Here Doctor Milner stops, but the father adds, “ and which was raised from the dead; they, therefore, resisting the grace of God, die in their disputes.” The Greek word προσευχης, which the Doctor renders † *oblations*, signifies *prayer*. But his motive for thus mis-translating is evidently for the purpose of raising in the reader’s mind the idea, that Ignatius condemned those heretics for abstaining—from what? Not from the Eucharist and *prayer*,

* Ευχαριστίας δε ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗΣ απιχονται, δια το μη ὁμολογεῖν τὴν ευχαριστιαν σαρκα εἶναι τῆ σωτηρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, &c. &c.—*Epist. ad Smyrn. c. vii.*

† Dr. Milner must surely have overlooked the original, and taken the father’s meaning from a Latin version. Instances of a similar kind are so numerous throughout his Work, that a person is almost tempted to believe him to be in the same happy state with the Neapolitan Jesuit, who, we are somewhere told, gravely returned thanks to Heaven, that he was ignorant of the Greek language, for that the knowledge of it was a *sure sign* of heresy!

but the Eucharist and oblations; that is, from the Eucharist and the sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood!

We must recollect, that the † *Docetæ*, against whom Ignatius wrote, were those visionaries who conceived, that the Birth, Passion, &c. of Christ, were imaginary; and who, impressed with the conviction of Christ's ærial form, refused the Eucharist, because it was said to be His Body. The father, therefore, argues, that, as the elements of bread and wine are, by a just construction, the Body and Blood of Christ, he must have had a real body. Without this supposition, the Eucharist was no Eucharist at all; it was a representation of nothing, or a false representation. "Ignatius," says Waterland, "*could not* imagine that the symbols were literally flesh and blood; but if they were *constructionally* or *interpretatively* so, it was all his argument required." He did not suppose, that there was a natural body locally present, and also a sacramental body; but that all was one *symbolical* body. Of this, those unbelievers were perfectly sensible, and, therefore, they abstained from the Eucharist, and the accompanying *prayer*, as being founded on the doctrine of our Lord's *real* humanity.

Lastly, even supposing Ignatius to have

† REVIEW of the Doct. of the Euch. ed. 1737, p. 215.

spoken of the substance of Christ's flesh as present in the Eucharist, he is entirely silent about the *change* of the substance of the bread into that of Christ's Body; the very point which Doctor Milner undertakes to prove from his writings. In the very Epistle under consideration, he makes express mention of the proof which Christ afforded His disciples, who supposed him to be a spirit: * "Handle me and see; for a spirit *hath not flesh and bones* as ye see me have." It therefore follows, that Ignatius could not have held, that the real Body of Christ was in the Eucharist, when it could not be judged of by the senses; as he would, in that case, have weakened the force of his former argument.

2. JUSTIN MARTYR is next adduced by Doctor Milner. On examination it will be seen, that this father's testimony is as adverse to the Popish doctrine as that of Ignatius, while he speaks the language of the Church of England on the subject. In truth, it is not possible to form a conjecture, how any reader of the original Greek could wrest Justin's meaning into one favourable to the Romish Church, since he expressly says, that the *consecrated* elements are nutritive of our bodies like *other food*. Doctor

* Luke, xxiv. 39.

Milner barely mentions his name, leaving the reader to infer, that his testimony has the same bearing as that he ascribed to Ignatius. But the father must speak for himself. † “We do not,” says he, “take these as common bread, or as common drink, but we consider the food so blessed *through the prayer of the Word*, (which came from Him, by which our flesh and blood *are nourished* by its conversion into them) to be the Body and Blood of that Jesus, who became incarnate.” He then proceeds to say, that the Apostles relate, that when Jesus had taken the bread and given thanks, he said, *Do this*, ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ ΜΟΥ. What Justin has written to this effect is too long for insertion; but enough is given to shew the gross misapplication which is made of his language. The elements, after consecration, are called *food*, and although not considered *common* bread and wine; yet they are called so by these names, and are said to *nourish* our flesh and blood, and are only understood in the very acceptation which we take them, that is *symbolically*, to be the Body and Blood of Christ.

3. IRENÆUS, who comes next in order, also

* Ου γὰρ ὡς ΚΟΙΝΟΝ ἄρτον εἶδε ΚΟΙΝΟΝ πῶμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν, - - - - - ἕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγῳ τε παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστοῦσαν τροφήν ΕΞ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σὰρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν ΤΡΕΦΟΝΤΑΙ ἡμῶν, &c. &c.—APOL. ii. ad Antonin. p. 125.

believed, that the eucharistic elements **increased* our bodies like other food, and consequently, that they retained their nature as bread and wine, only in a more exalted degree, and as if endued with certain heavenly virtues. In his arguments against the Marcionite heretics, he says, “when, therefore, the mixed cup and the bread become the Eucharist of the Body and Blood of Christ, †by which the substance of our flesh is *increased*; how can they deny, that the flesh, which is *nourished* by the Body and Blood of Christ, receives the gift of God?” In both editions of Irenæus’s works, of 1702, and 1710, I found the respective editors, Grabe and Massuet, labouring to prove Transubstantiation from the words of that father, and to do away the effect of this and similar passages. They argue, that if the elements be not transubstantiated, then, that Christ was a *phantom*: this is what the heretics affirmed, and the very opposite to what Irenæus had established. In fact, according to them, that father must have considered the bread and wine in the Eucharist to be *substantially* the body and blood of Christ. This exactly suits Doc-

* 'Αφ' ἐ τα ἡμετέρα ΑΥΞΕΙ σώματα.—IREN. advers. Hæres. lib. iv. c. 2. p. 396.

† Εκ τῆτων δὲ ΑΥΞΕΙ καὶ συνίσταται ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν υποστάσις.—Ibid.

tor Milner, and he accordingly assumes the point, as we may suppose, on their authority. But let the meaning be elicited from the original, and it will be seen, that from any supposition of Transubstantiation, the arguments of Irenæus and the orthodox must have yielded to those of the heretics.

4. St. CYPRIAN'S Epistle to Cornelius is the fourth reference made by Dr. Milner. After a most attentive perusal of that epistle in the original work, I could not discover a single passage which glanced at Transubstantiation; except it be supposed, that the father alluded to it where he asks, "how can we make those fit to taste the cup of martyrdom, if we do not first admit them to communicate in the cup of the Lord?" I should not quote words so inappropriate to such a meaning, did I not perceive from a note on them, that some writer like Doctor Milner, whom Cyprian's annotator reproves, fancied he saw the doctrine of the corporeal presence established by them! Pamelius, the person I allude to, thus comments on this passage; * "there is no mention here of concomitance, of Transubstantiation, of the adoration of the signs, or of carrying them about." Cyprian speaks of the Body of our Lord in the

* Nulla hic concomitantia, transubstantiationis, manducationis oralis.—PAMEL. in loc.

Eucharist not only as bread, but as *being composed of flour and water, and representing the union of the Church with Christ. Of the wine, he says, † “when it is mixed with water, the people is united with Christ.” Throughout the epistle, quoted by Dr. Milner, he refers to the real substance of bread and wine; while he diverts our attention from the body of Christ. This is one of the ways familiar to the ancient fathers, when speaking of the elements, and which, as much as any other, negatives the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

5. ORIGEN's evidence is equally at variance with the doctrine, which he is said to support. In truth, were not Dr. Milner's judgment under a most unnatural bias, he would admit, that whatever virtue was attributed by this ancient writer to the elements after consecration, he considered their material substance to remain *unaltered*, and to contribute to the support of our bodies, like any common food. Thus, he says, “even the meat, which is sanctified by the word of God and by

* Nam quando Dominus corpus suum panem vocat, de multorum granorum adunatione congestum, populum nostrum quem portabat indicat adunatum.—EPIST. lxxvi. sect. 4. p. 153.

† Quando in calice vino aqua miscetur, Christo populus adunatur.—EPIST. lxiii. sect. 10. p. 108.

prayer, * as touching the material part thereof, *goeth into the belly, and is voided into the draught.*" He then adds, † "it is not the *matter* of the bread, but the word that is said over it, that profits him who eats it not unworthily of the Lord." And concludes in this decisive manner, ‡ "and these things I speak of the *typical or symbolical body.*" Here are epithets applied to the elements, which are quite irreconcilable with the idea of Transubstantiation.

Doctor Milner impeaches Bishop Tomline's judgment for appealing to Origen's authority in his exposition of the xxviiith article; when he affirms, that the passage cited by his Lordship § "is *nothing at all* to the purpose." The Bishop, after observing that more than twenty fathers understood our Saviour's words in a *figurative* sense, without *one* support on the opposite side, rests his cause on Origen's single testimony in the Greek, where he says, || "that the understanding our Saviour's words, of eating

* Κατ' αὐτο μέν το ὕλικόν εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφελδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται.—ORIG. in Matt. xv. 15.

† Καὶ ἐκ ἧ ὕλη τῆ ἀρτῆ, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπ' αὐτο εἰρημένος λόγος, &c.—IBID.

‡ Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῆ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος.—IBID.

§ LETTER xxxvii. p. 50.

|| ELEM. OF THEOL., vol. ii. p. 468.

his flesh and drinking his blood according to the letter, is a letter that *kills*." This passage *nothing to the purpose!* Well, let us see what Dr. Milner cites from the father as being to the purpose. * "Manna was formerly given as a figure; but now the flesh and blood of the Son of God is specifically given, and is real food." I must here observe, that I have not been able to discover this passage in Origen's seventh homily on Leviticus, after a most patient search for it in Genebrard's edition. However, granting that it escaped my notice, I see nothing in it which disproves what the Bishop says; as the father, having once admitted the figure, might consistently expatiate on the real signification of his words to any extent he pleased. Thus, to the question, † "how can he give us his body?" he replies, "believe it, because those are *figures* which are written in the divine volumes." Against the Marcionites he urges, ‡ "if Christ were without body and blood, of what kind of flesh, or of what kind of body, or of what kind of blood, did he give the bread and the cup to be *images*; when he

* HOM. vii. in Levit.

† Quia *figuræ* sunt, quæ in divinis voluminibus scripta sunt. IUD.

‡ Εἰ δ' ὥς ἔτοι φασιν, ἀσαρκος, καὶ ἀναιμὸς ἦν, ποίας σαρκος, ἢ τίνος σωματός, ἢ ποῖα ἁίματος Εἰκὼνας διδὼς ἀρτοῦτε καὶ ποτήριον, &c.—Orig. Dialog. iii.

commanded his disciples to make a *commemoration* of him by them?" His distinction, too, between the eating the *typical* and the *true* body of Christ is thus clearly drawn. * "That which is sanctified by God and by prayer, *does not* of its own nature sanctify him that useth it; for if that were so, it would sanctify him that doth eat *unworthily* of the Lord." This is exactly conformable to our xxixth article; while it explains the language of our Church Catechism, and is incompatible with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, according to which † "the *wicked*, and such as be *void* of a lively faith," partake of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It is unnecessary to add another proof how fully the Bishop of Winchester was borne out in saying, that Origen only understood our Saviour's words in a figurative sense.

Although apprehensive that I shall have appeared too minute in the foregoing references, yet I must entreat the reader's further indulgence, while I briefly state a few of those ‡ "*beautiful* testimonies for the (Roman) Catholic doctrine," to which Dr. Milner barely adverts. It were unpardonable, after his *particular* commendation of them, to leave them unnoticed.

* ID. in Matt. xv.

† ARTICLE XXIX.

‡ LETTER XXXVII. p. 50.

6. BASIL says, “we have often observed, that the operations of the mind are called by the *same names* as those of the outward members. But, as our Lord is the true bread, and his flesh is the true meat, it is necessary that the delightful pleasure which we receive from that bread should be conveyed to us, * *by our tasting it spiritually.*”

7. CHRYSOSTOM asks, † “for if Jesus be not dead, whose *symbols* are they which are offered?” He then adds, “since, therefore, the word says, *This is my body*, let us both obey and believe, and *look upon it with the eyes of the understanding.* For what Christ delivered has *nothing* to do with the senses; but although joined with sensible objects, ALL IS SPIRITUAL.”

8. JEROME says, ‡ “in the *type* of his blood, he offered not water, but wine.”

9. AUSTIN remarks, § “how the signs are *varied*, faith remaining the same; in the wilderness, the *Rock* was Christ; to us that which is placed on the altar is Christ.”

10. CYRIL’S sentiments on this subject are put beyond the possibility of doubt. In his

* Δια γυνσιως ἡμιν ΝΟΗΤΗΣ ἐγγινισθαι.—In Ps. xliv. 8.

† ΝΟΗΤΟΙΣ αὐτο βλεπωμιν οφθαλμοις παντα δε ΝΟΗΤΑ.
—In Matt. Hom. lxxxii.

‡ Advers. Jovin. lib. ii. p. 198.

§ Ibi *Petra* Christus, nobis Christus quod in altari Dei ponitur.—In Johan. sect. xii.

reasoning on the figurative acceptation of the vith of John, he refers to what Christ told the Jews, that unless they eat his flesh and drank his blood, they had no life in them. "But they,"* says he, "not understanding these things which were spoken *spiritually*, went back, thinking that he invited them to an eating of his flesh."

Were I to name one of those early writers more than another, to whom the most flagrant injustice has been done, I should particularize Cyril. The passage from this father's writings, which Dr. Milner has quoted, is precisely the same as that, which Ward, above a century ago, published in a mutilated state, as expressive of his sentiments, after so much had been taken out of the context as would have determined its meaning. The re-production of it now is the more inexcusable; as the Doctor should have assigned some reason for following in Ward's track, after the detection and exposure of the fraud in my † strictures on that author. I have there exhibited in its true colours, his disingenuous attempt to palm on the public the passage in question as the unbroken narrative of Cyril, after he had pared it down to suit his

* Εκεῖνοι μὴ ἀκηκοότες ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΩΣ τῶν λεγομένων ἀπηλθον.
—Cateches. Myst. iv. p. 293.

† See ANSWER to Ward's *Errata*, p. 123.

particular purpose. Nor can I now condemn in less severe terms the artifice to which his servile imitator has had recourse.

11. AMBROSE's testimony is the last in Doctor Milner's catalogue. This father compares the change, which takes place in the elements of the Eucharist, to the regeneration of a man in baptism. But as this change is of a *spiritual* nature, he could not illustrate the point, if he considered such change in the elements as of a material or corporeal one. Thus he says, * "thou thyself did exist but as an old creature. After you were consecrated, you began to be a new creature." Again, † "the priest says, make this *oblation* applicable, rational, acceptable, which is the *figure* of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." There is not the slightest countenance given here to Transubstantiation; even the very passage, on which Doctor Milner relies, is no less adverse to it. I shall now produce it, still advising the reader to bear in mind, that a figure once admitted, the subsequent discussion may consist of realities. The unconnected form into which he has thrown it, precludes the possibility of my detect-

* Tu ipse eras, sed eras vetus creatura; postquam consecratus es; nova creatura esse cœpisti.—De Sacram. lib. iv. c. 4.

† Fac nobis hanc oblationem ascriptam . . . quod est *figura* Dom. N. I. C.—*Ibid.* Lib. iv. c. 5.

ing any operation of the pruning knife such as that performed on Cyril. The Doctor has therefore all the advantage which this circumstance, and his own arrangement can give him. * “How many examples do we produce to shew you, that this is not what nature made it, but what the benediction has consecrated it; and that the benediction is of greater force than nature, because by the benediction nature itself is changed.” Then after speaking of the miracle performed on Moses’s rod, the father is made by Doctor Milner to say; “Thou hast read of the creation of the world: if Christ by his word was able to make something out of nothing, shall he not be thought able to change one thing into another?” The father says nothing more, nor less, than that the elements after consecration are endued with more heavenly graces than they had before it; but that they retain their properties *unchanged*. But although Christ’s power to perform the miracle spoken of, be unquestioned, and although the Gospel may seem to say that he wrought one at his last Supper; where, I would ask, is it even remotely intimated in Scripture, that he delegated such power to the priests of the present day? I therefore infer, from every view of the subject, the insufficiency of those “*beautiful testimo-*

* AMBROS. de his qui Myst. Init. c. ix.

nies" alluded to by Doctor Milner, to establish the Popish doctrine, or * "to refute" what he calls, "the rash assertions of two Protestant Bishops." Other passages from the fathers, of the same tendency, could be multiplied to an indefinite amount; but enough has been produced to shew the gross perversion to which their authority has been subjected.

By the way, I cannot avoid noticing, that Tertullian's name does not appear in Doctor Milner's list. The omission is the more remarkable, as that father stands foremost, when he labours to establish other points, which the Church of England does not deny. But as Tertullian's writings are necessarily included among the "numberless documents," which "all the fathers" furnish in support of the Doctor's opinions, I shall give a few specimens of the kind of support, which he derives from this particular source, as he has, for reasons perfectly obvious, not done so himself.

"We ought not," † says he, "to offer unto God earthly, but *spiritual* sacrifices, as it is written, the sacrifice of God is an *humble* and *contrite* spirit; offer also unto God the *sacrifice*

* LETTER xxxvii. p. 51.

† "Non terrenis sacrificiis, sed *spiritualibus* litandum cor contribulatum et humiliatum *hostia* Deo est;" et alibi, "sacrifica Deo *sacrificium* laudis."—TERTUL. adversus Jud. c. v. p. 188.

of praise." Again, * " Christ made the bread his Body, by saying, THIS IS MY BODY; that is, the *figure* of my Body." His arguments against the Academics are such as might with propriety be urged against the Romish Doctors, who, like those heretics, discredit the testimony of the senses. After stating the extent to which their evidence was applied during our Lord's ministry, he thus concludes: " Neither was nature abused, as far as the Apostles were concerned: † *faithful* also was the taste of that wine, which had before been water at the marriage of Galilee: Thomas's touch was *faithful*." I would here inquire, whether the sacramental bread has a different taste after, from what it had before, consecration; as the fluid had at the marriage feast, after the performance of the miracle? Does it resemble flesh in taste, or any other substance, rather than bread? And is not the whole representation an act of the mind and of faith? Let Doctor Milner answer these questions, if he can. However, I trust I have assigned satisfactory reasons, why he has in the present instance, omitted to mention a name, which on other occasions he holds

* " Corpus illum suum fecit, HOC EST CORPUS MEUM dicendo, id est, *figura* corporis mei."—ID. contra Marcion. lib. iv. c. 40.

† See Note (*) p. 138.

up as of paramount authority : while I have on the whole of the evidence brought forward, fully proved, “ that *all* the fathers, and the whole series of ecclesiastical history,” instead of being “ on his side,” as he so positively asserts, are in direct opposition to him.

We shall now see, how he gets over the difficulty, which our Saviour’s words, at the very institution of this Sacrament, produce, on the supposition of his being corporeally present in it. Those words are, do this *in remembrance of me* : in which, Doctor Milner says, there is no contradiction ; * “ for the Eucharist is both a *memorial* of Christ and the *real* (viz. *corporeal*) presence of Christ. When a person stands visibly before us, we have no need of any sign to call him to our memory ; but if he were present in such a manner as to be concealed from our senses, we might, without a memorial of him, as easily forget him as if he were at a great distance from us.” I ask, in the name of common sense, what are we to suppose that the memorial of a person implies ? It cannot surely be the very person himself ; but something or other, which represents him in his absence. This is the declared opinion of the fathers, when they speak of what the Eucharist was designed to commemorate ; which he cannot, as a member of a Church,

* LETTER xxxviii. p. 59.

which bends so much to authority, refuse to acknowledge. Thus says—

TERTULLIAN.—* “The image *cannot* be every way adequate to the truth; for it is one thing to be *according to* the truth, another to be the *truth itself*.” Again: † “No person intending to shew a man, produces a helmet or a mask.”

ATHANASIUS. — ‡ “That which is like another thing, is not *the thing itself* to which it is like.”

HILARY and AMBROSE.—|| “Neither is any one an *image* of himself.”

GREGORY NYSS.—§ “The original is plainly seen in the *likeness* of it.”

CHRYSOSTOM.—¶ “A sign is *inferior* to that of which it is a sign.”

JEROME.—** “He left us a *commemoration* or

* “Imago veritati *non usquequaque* adæquabitur.”—Contra Marcion. lib. ii. c. 9.

† “Nemo ostendere volens hominem, *cassidem* aut *personam* introducit.”—De Carne Christi, c. ii.

‡ Το ὅμοιον τινι, οὐκ ἐστὶ ΑΥΤΟ ΕΚΕΙΝΟ ὃ ὁμοιοῦται.—Contra Hypocr. Milet.

|| “Neque enim sibi ipsi quisquam *imago* est.”—De Synodis et De Fide.

§ Το ἀρχετυπον ἐναργῶς ἐν τοῦ μίμηματι καθορασθαι.—In Cant. Hom. xv.

¶ ΚΑΤΑΔΕΕΣΤΕΡΑ ὅσον σημεῖον τοῦ πραγματος ἢ πρὸς ἐστὶ σημεῖον.

** “Ultimam nobis *commemorationem* sive *memoriam* dereliquit.”—Oper. Tom. v. p. 998.

memory of himself. As if one going abroad should leave some pledge to a person whom he loves, that as often as he sees it, he may *remember* both his benefits and his friendship." And

AUSTIN, who is, and always has decidedly been, the greatest favourite in the Romish Church, says, * "no person remembers any thing, but such as is *not present*."

The reader now sees how successful Doctor Milner has been in his appeal to the fathers: that which he makes to the eminent bishops and divines of the establishment in this country will next claim our attention. He expressly names LAUD, ANDREWS, COSIN, and BRAMHALL, with five or six others; and adds the justly esteemed divine, HOOKER. † Their testimonies for the Real Presence, he says, ‡ "are as explicit as Roman Catholics themselves can wish them to be." As a *Catholic*, I subscribe to their opinions; but I shall prove, from their own lips, that their sentiments are most adverse to the *Popish* idea of the Real Presence.

To begin with || LAUD. In this Prelate's Conference with Fisher the Jesuit, he first states, that Bellarmine held "that the *conver-*

* "Nemo recordatur nisi quod in *præsentia non est* positum. Oper. tom. iv. p. 220.

† It is deserving of notice, that Jewell's name is suppressed in this, as Tertullian's was in the former catalogue.

‡ LETTER xxxvii. p. 53.

|| Page 286.

sion of the bread and wine, into the Body and Blood of Christ, is substantial, but after a secret and ineffable manner." Now, says the Archbishop, "if he had left out *conversion*, and only affirmed Christ's Real Presence there, after a mysterious and ineffable manner, no man could have spoken better." He then shews, from a comparison of two passages, where that writer contradicts himself; that though he affirms in the one a *corporeal* Presence of Christ in the Sacrament; yet, in the other, he denies that it is *corporaliter*, i. e. "after the manner in which bodies naturally exist." LAUD next alludes to the clear manner in which Cranmer speaks on the subject. * "If you understand by their word really, *reipsá*, that is, in very deed and effectually, so Christ, by the efficacy of his passion, is *indeed* and *truly* present; but if you understand *corporaliter*, in His natural and organical Body, under the form of Bread and Wine, it is *contrary* to the Word of God." He next quotes Ridley to the same effect, and adverts to the recantation of Berengarius, who admitted thereby the *oral* manducation of the *real* Body of Christ, at which the learned † Averroes took such offence. But why multiply instances to shew the *nature* of the REAL PRESENCE held

* Page 259.

† Mundum peragravi, et non vidi sectam deteriorem, et magis fatuam Christianâ, quia Deum quem colunt, *dentibus devorant*.—Oper. Vol. i. p. 68. Ed. 1608.

by Laud. Indeed, so explicit is he on this point, that it is wonderful how Doctor Milner could have confidence enough to quote him as an advocate for the Popish doctrine.

ANDREWS, Bishop of Winchester, comes next, and distinctly pronounces Transubstantiation to be a "*modern invention*," not having been named for above *twelve hundred years after* Christ. * "I agree," says he, "with Gregory of Nyssa, that the nature of the bread and wine is changed; yet, that *neither them*, nor *us* is transubstantiated." After stating the opinions of several fathers, the Bishop concludes with observing, † "that the change in the Sacrament is *not substantial*." He then says, that St. Austin divided the Eucharist into two parts; viz. the *Sacramentum*, and the *res Sacramenti*. ‡ "That Christ, the *subject* (res) of the Sacrament was to be adored, but not the Sacrament—namely the *earthly* part, as Irenæus expresses it; or that which is exposed *to the sight*, as Augustin says." Can any thing, therefore,

* Et nos, cum Nysseno credimus, virtute benedictionis, panis et vini naturam immutari, nec tamen vel *ipsa*, vel *nos* transubstantiari.—ANSWER to Bellarmine, p. 192.

† *Substantialem non esse*, quæ in Sacramento fit, transmutationem.—IBID. p. 195.

‡ Christus *Sacramenti res* adorandus est; at non *Sacramentum*, *terrena* scilicet *pars*, ut Irenæus; visibilis, ut Augustinus.—IBID.

be plainer than the injustice done to Bishop Andrews, when he is said to have “firmly believed” the corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

Having vindicated Bishop Cosin, in the concluding part of the last chapter, from the foul imputation of advocating the Popish doctrine of the corporeal Presence; I pass on to the equally abused authority of ARCHBISHOP BRAMHALL.

In his Answer to Le Militiere, he says, **“I find not one of your arguments, that comes home to Transubstantiation, but only to a true, real presence, which no genuine son of the Church of England did ever deny, no, nor your adversary himself. Christ said, THIS IS MY BODY; what he said, we do stedfastly believe, he said, [not, after this manner, or that manner,] neque con, neque sub, neque trans; and therefore we place it among the opinions of the schools, not among the articles of our faith.”* In order to make the preceding passage speak the language of the Church of Rome, Doctor Milner leaves out the first clause, which is put in italics, and then transposes the second one. He likewise omits the words within the brackets. By this contrivance, the distinction, which the Archbishop drew between Transubstantiation and

* BRAMHALL'S ANSWER, Fol. Ed. p. 15.

“the true real presence,” by which he evidently meant the *spiritual* presence, being done away ; the words ‘ *real presence*,’ are, from their ambiguity, necessarily made to imply the *corporeal* presence !

But the Archbishop has put it beyond the reach of sophistry to make him even appear friendly to this monstrous doctrine. He speaks of the * “ fathers seeing Christ in the Sacrament, fastening their teeth in his flesh, and making their tongues red in his blood.” “ They never meant,” says he, “ by these forms of speech, the manner of the presence ; but to raise the devotion of the hearers.” Again, “ Transubstantiation was not *an old article* of faith : it was not well digested, nor rightly understood above a *thousand years after* Christ.” Then, after enlarging on the miraculous conversion of the water into wine at the marriage feast, and of Moses’s rod into a serpent, he reverts to the subject of Transubstantiation. “ The substance of the elements is not converted, for that is supposed to be destroyed ; the accidents are not converted, but remain the same they were. It is no adduction at all, when the Body of Christ (which is the thing supposed to be adduced) remains still in Heaven, where it was before.” Lastly, he says, † “ *we have rejected*

* *Ibid.* p. 17.

† *Ibid.* p. 36.

Transubstantiation *deservedly* from being an article of our Creed ; but if we had rejected it 400 years sooner, that had been a miracle : (Bramhall was born A. D. 1593), it was not so soon hatched. To find but the word Transubstantiation in any old author were sufficient to find him a counterfeit." I fear, I shall have appeared somewhat tedious in my quotations ; but I set too high a value on the authority of those eminent Prelates to allow garbled statements to go forth as expressive of their opinions, when they stand in direct contradiction to their real sentiments.

Doctor Milner's treatment of HOOKER does not correspond with the respect he professes to entertain for that profound writer. What will the reader say, when he is told, that two folio pages intervene between the two sentences which Doctor Milner has joined together, and cited as if they stood so in the original ? Might not the Scriptures themselves be thus made to speak contradictions, absurdities, and falsehoods ?

* Hooker thus expresses himself on this important question : " As touching a literal, corporal, and oral manducation of the very substance of Christ's flesh and blood, this is surely an opinion *no where* delivered in holy Scripture."

* ECCLES. POLITY, book v. sect. 67. p. 260.

Immediately after he says, * “ in a word, *it appeareth not*, that of all the other ancient fathers of the Church, *any one did ever conceive other than only a mystical participation of Christ’s both Body and Blood in the Sacrament.*” He uniformly dwells on this point, “ that the real presence of Christ’s most blessed Body and Blood *is not* to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in *the worthy receiver* of the Sacrament.” And, lastly, “ there is *no* sentence in holy scripture, which saith, that we cannot by this Sacrament be made partakers of his Body and Blood, *except* they be first contained in the Sacrament, *or* the Sacrament *first converted* into them.” Such are the sentiments of that judicious writer; although Doctor Milner affects to say, that on the part of the Church of England, he is “ *as explicit* as (Roman) Catholics can wish him to be,” in favour of the corporeal presence of Christ in the Sacrament! Thus we see, notwithstanding all his empty flourishes, that he is unsupported either by ancient or modern authority, respecting the Popish interpretation of the real presence.

Christ’s body is present, says Dr. Milner, though concealed from our senses. In other words, his very flesh, which was nailed on the cross, is present, although we do not perceive

* *IBID.* p. 261.

it; although the other senses bear testimony, that there is no delusion of the sight; and although the early fathers never made Christ's body invisible, but because he was absent. But Dr. Milner tells us what they *do not*, that the body lying before us is *invisible*; although its invisibility demonstrates its absence! that is, we are told, that its presence demonstrates its absence; or, what is no less absurd, that its absence demonstrates its presence! Besides, where is the proof of this corporeal presence, except the mere assertion of the Church of Rome? None whatever. We know that God is present in all his creatures; but were he present after the manner alleged by that Church, he would, no doubt, make a sensible manifestation of himself, as he did to Moses by his **Shekinah*, or glory. As, therefore, we perceive no alteration in the eucharistic elements either at, or after the time of consecration, we may safely infer, that they are not the habitation of his corporeal presence. This is what I contend for, and I defy Dr. Milner to disprove the truth or justice of my arguments.

Again, Doctor Milner insists, that our chief objections against this doctrine † "is the testimony of the senses; and that though this be a

* See PRESERV. against Pop., Tit. vii. ut supra.

† LETTER XXXVIII. p. 59.

good topic for pulpit oratory, it will not stand the test of Christian Theology. It would undermine the incarnation itself. With equal reason the Jews said of Christ, *Is this the carpenter's son?* Hence, they concluded, that he was not what he proclaimed himself to be, "The Son of God." For my part, I can see no likeness between the two cases; because my senses give evidence to the fact in the one, that what has the properties of bread, is bread; but, in the other, although my senses may testify the actual existence of a certain individual, they neither can tell the relation, which that individual bears to other persons; nor of themselves determine the truth of what he says. The senses of the Apostles bore evidence to the truth of Christ's miracles, and those miracles proved the truth of his professions; but the truth of his professions could never have been ascertained by the testimony of the senses, without the intervention of miracles.

It is further urged by Doctor Milner, that our senses are not to be relied on, for, * "that Joshua *thought* he saw a man, and Jacob that he touched one, and Abraham that he eat with three men; when, in all these instances, there were no real men, but unembodied spirits, the different senses of those patriarchs *misleading*

* *IBID.*

them." Neither here do I discover any similitude; because, if they were deceived in supposing ærial forms of human shape to be real men, the delusion was such as might be expected. In none of the cases mentioned, could the senses be brought into play, as there were not subjects on which to exercise them; they consequently could not be said to mislead. For, it was an *angel* which appeared to *Joshua; it was an *angel* that wrestled with †Jacob; and they were *three angels*, whom ‡Abraham entertained. But let Doctor Milner furnish an instance, where both sight and touch have at the same time been so imposed on, that shadows should seem to possess what they had not, the properties of bodies, their solidity and substance; and then, the appositeness of his parallel will be acknowledged. But as for visions, dreams, and the like, they are totally inapplicable.

Again.—How can the reliance we repose on our senses, undermine the Incarnation itself, it being a mystery; while in Transubstantiation there is no mystery at all? We can as clearly comprehend the most palpable falsehoods, as we can the most evident truths. In the Incarnation, we can see nothing false, or contrary to our reason; but this is not the case in Transubstantiation. The former, we believe to be

* Chap. v. 13.

† GEN. xxxii. 24.

‡ IBID. xviii. 8.

a truth, on the express declaration of the Word of God ; the latter, we consider a falsehood, because unaccompanied by those signs and tokens which distinguish the miracles of Christ.

From Scripture, Doctor Milner appeals to philosophy and experience to prove, that *each* of our senses frequently deceives us. On this point, there can be but one opinion. But the thing for him to shew is, that *all* our senses at any time deceive us in matters cognizable by them. He instances a setting sun, which is below, at the moment it appears to be above, the horizon. True:—there is an optical delusion there. But, if for this we substitute Augustin's example, which, like Doctor Milner's, depends on the laws of refraction, we shall find two senses brought to bear on the same object, and one of them rectifying the mistake of the other. * “If,” says Austin, “one thinks that an oar is broken in the water, and when it is taken out of the water made whole again, he has not a bad reporter, but he is a bad judge. For, if the air be a different medium from water, it must be perceived, one way in air, and *an-*

* “ Si quis remum frangi in aquâ opinatur, et cum inde aufertur integrari, non habet malum internuncium, sed malus est iudex si enim aliud est aer, aliud aqua, justum ut aliter in aere, aliter in aquâ sentiatur.”—*De Vera Relig.* c. xxxiii.

other in water." Here the sight itself detects, and the touch confirms the error; which could not happen in the case of the setting sun.

His proof, that we are deceived by the sense of touch, and that we cannot trust more to it than to any other sense, is quite amusing. * "Let any person," says he, "cause his neighbour to shut his eyes, and then crossing the two first fingers of either hand, make him rub a pea, or any other round substance, between them, he will then protest, that he feels *two* such objects." But let the person submit this puerile trick to the test of vision, and his error will be instantly removed. Thus it appears, that it is only by the evidence of our senses that we know any thing. To say, that the substance of the bread does not exist in the Sacrament, when all its properties appear, and that the substance of the flesh is there, although without the † appearance of any of them, is a monstrous contradiction! It is, as ‡ one father says, to suppose the Almighty to do what is absurd (*αποπον*); and as § another says, what is contrary to nature (*παρά φύσιν*) and impossible. It is to suppose God to

* LETTER xxxviii. p. 60.

† When Doctor Milner uses the word *species*, he considers it to be an *accident*, which inheres in *no* substance, but subsists by itself. Matter *without* primary qualities!

‡ CLEM. ALEX. Stromat. lib. iv. c. 26.

§ ORIG. contra Cels. lib. v. sect. 23.

pursue a course contrary to what he has done in every other instance, where the miracle wrought derived its effect from, and is expressly submitted to, the senses.

How, therefore, can Doctor Milner come to such a conclusion as this; that, because each of our senses frequently deceives us, (not observe *constantly*, but *now* and *again*,) that they must *all*, therefore, often deceive us in matters cognizable by them? Or, how can he say, that I oppose their fallible testimony to God's infallible Word, if I submit that bread on which the reputed miracle is wrought to the judgment of my senses; when I perceive, that all the miracles, which Christ performed when on earth, were not only submitted to the senses of His disciples, but most pointedly referred to them? Doctor Milner may believe all he says, if he can; but as for the poor laity, when they are thus *instructed and invited to *cozen* themselves, can we wonder at their besotted adherence to the Church of Rome?

I shall add but a few words more. The literal acceptation of the phrase, THIS IS MY BODY, is inadmissible; because, the miracle, which Doctor Milner says they imply, cannot be re-

* In their Mass Book, the laity are required individually to make this declaration, "*Herein I utterly renounce the judgment of my senses, and all human understanding.*"—ENGLISH MANUAL, Ed. 1725, p. 409.

conciled with the instructions of our Lord to his disciples at Capernaum, that they were to understand what he said about eating His flesh, not literally, but *spiritually*. It is further inadmissible, because it is not only repugnant to the evidence of the senses, as I have proved, but likewise to the laws of nature; that Christ should have held His Body in His own hand, thereby making the transubstantiated bread to exist under two *distinct* shapes, its natural and assumed, at one and the same time. Moses's rod was turned into a serpent; yet the rod and the serpent did not co-exist under two different forms, as the Body of Christ and the Bread which He blessed must have done. The difficulty is further increased; if, as the Romish Church says, Christ be considered * *whole* and *entire*, within the contracted dimensions of a wafer. For, if He be whole and entire in one wafer, He cannot be *whole* and *entire* in another wafer, or in a thousand others, at the same instant, which would be to make two bodies, or a thousand bodies, *whole* and *entire*, of Christ, all co-existent. On this † supposition, the same body might be far distant from itself, come and meet itself, be at rest and in motion at the same time, which are direct contradictions! This

* “*Totus et integer* Christus est sub quâlibet quoque parte hostiæ consecratæ.”—BINNII CONCIL. vol. v. pars Ima. p. 614.

† See SECKER'S SERMONS, vol. vi. p. 80.

line of argument will equally apply, whether Christ's Body be considered in its "glorified state," as Doctor Milner says, "on Mount Tabor;" or in its natural state, when he instituted the Eucharist. For whether *spiritual* or *natural*, it cannot be *whole* and *entire*, in two different places, at the same moment of time; because God can do nothing, which is, in its own nature, impossible or absurd. I say *spiritual*, for a spiritual body is as subject to the *same* impossibility, in this respect, as a natural body; and because Christ's appearing to St. Paul on the road to Damascus, after His Ascension, as urged by Doctor Milner, is no proof, that His spiritual Body, which is *whole* and *entire* at His Father's right hand in Heaven, can be *whole* and *entire* within the narrow compass of a piece of bread on the altar, at the same time.

The last point, on which Doctor Milner relies, is this, * "That God fills all space, and is whole and entire in every particle of matter; and that his own soul is in his right hand and in his left, *whole* and *entire*." This objection I have met in the preceding paragraph; I shall, therefore, simply remind him, that Omnipresence is *not* Transubstantiation. I sincerely believe the REAL PRESENCE of Christ in the

* LETTER XXXVIII. p. 61.

Sacrament after a *spiritual* manner; because, I believe His Presence to be **UNIVERSAL, IMMUTABLE**, and *always subsisting*; but the doctrine of Transubstantiation requires me to believe, that the elements, which *I see*, are converted into a Body, which *I do not see*; and therefore, I as sincerely reject it.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SUPPRESSION OF HALF THE EUCHARIST,
SACRILEGIOUS.

WERE it not to shew the high authority, which Tradition holds in the Church of Rome, it would have been unnecessary for Doctor Milner to preface his Letter on the subject of half communion, with an allusion to Infant Baptism. * “Protestants,” he says, “are forced to have recourse to the Tradition of the Church on doubtful points, with respect to the two Sacraments, which they acknowledge; thus Christ was baptized in a river, and the Egyptian eunuch was led into the water, and infants also are susceptible of baptism, who are incapable of making an act of faith.” The † advocates of the Church of Rome, in imitation of the ‡ Council of Trent, uniformly represent Infant Baptism as an apostolical tradition. When they do this, they con-

* LETTER xxxix. p. 62.

† BELLARMINE says, “Parvulos baptizandos, vocatur *traditio apostolica*, non scripta.”—De Verbo Dei, lib. iv. c. 2.

‡ “*Ex traditione Apostolorum etiam parvuli* veraciter baptizantur, ut in eis regeneratione mundetur, quod generatione contraxerunt.”—CONCIL. TRIDENT., Sess. vii.

sider it, as a *doctrine* at least, in reference to its inward grace; but with respect to its outward and visible sign, as a *ceremony*. But since the Church of England uses its *own discretion* with respect to ceremonies, though it uniformly rejects doctrines, which have no other foundation than tradition, it may on the same principle be fairly inferred, that the ceremony of Infant Baptism has been observed in the Christian Church from the earliest ages. This, besides the agreeableness of the practice to Christ's Institution, furnishes an additional reason for our adoption of it. When, therefore, Doctor Milner says, that Protestants have recourse to tradition in certain cases, he * confounds tradition of doctrines with tradition of ceremonies; and consequently represents the Church of England, as similar in this respect to the Church of Rome, when they are altogether different.

Thus he may be supposed to argue: the Church of England professes to reject tradition of doctrines, while it adopts ceremonies, which are derivable from no other source, than tradition: therefore, as tradition in the one case, is tradition in the other, it necessarily follows, that its members must have recourse to *tradition* for determining doubtful points. This is, however, false reasoning. Our viith Article rejects tradition of doctrines, inasmuch as it

* See p. 3.

rejects "*whatsoever is not read in Holy Scriptures, nor proved thereby*;" and it should be observed, that in this rejection of tradition as a Rule of Faith consists the vital principle of the Reformation. The xxxivth Article no less rejects the sole authority of tradition in regard to ceremonies. If, therefore, the Church of England retains some *ceremonies, which have no other foundation than tradition, it does so for this substantial reason, not because they are supported by tradition; nor even because they are not contrary to Scripture; but, because they possess this positive quality, that *they tend to edification*. It speaks in the last-mentioned Article, of its not being "necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been diverse and *may be changed*; so that nothing be ordained *against* God's word." The concluding part of the Article says, that "every particular or national Church hath authority to *ordain, change, and abolish* ceremonies, or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's autho-

* BISHOP MARSH thus marks the difference between tradition of *ceremonies*, and tradition of *doctrines*: "the tradition of the latter is *oral*, and going from mouth to mouth must be perpetually subject to *alteration*. But the tradition of the former is *ocular* tradition, and may be preserved *unaltered* through a succession of ages, though never committed to writing."—COMP. VIZW, p. 144.

riety, so that *all things be done to edifying.*" From this it appears, that Doctor Milner, at the very outset, presents his reader with a gross misrepresentation.

Tradition as it regards the doctrine of Infant Baptism, is inapplicable to the Church of England, which expressly states in her xxviiith Article, that "the Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as *most agreeable* with the Institution of Christ." Here is *no* acknowledgment of tradition. On the contrary, it is disclaimed; while the sanction of the practice is traced to the example of our Blessed Lord Himself, and to His Holy Word. If our Saviour encouraged those who brought little children to Him, He likewise said to His disciples, * "Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Thus He gave them a general precept, without the least restriction whatever as to age; whether young or old, infants or adults, they were to be equally the objects of Baptism.

In like manner, with respect to the Eucharist, our Church retains what is essential to that Sacrament, while it has wisely omitted such circumstances as would be useless, inconvenient, or impossible to be complied with. It

* Matt. xxviii. 19.

performs the sacramental action, in the way commanded by Christ, when he said, “DO THIS;” by blessing bread and eating it, and by blessing wine and drinking it, in remembrance of Him. In this consists the *essence* of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and to the punctual observance of it, the Church of England is scrupulously attentive, while it omits circumstances in themselves indifferent, such as the **washing* of feet; the *time*, *place*, and *manner* of receiving, &c. &c. The charge of inconsistency, therefore, which Doctor Milner brings against it, falls to the ground, since it has been as little influenced by Tradition, when it agreed with the Church of Rome, in the omission of the latter points, which are unessential; as it was, when it rejected the doctrine and practice of that church in the remaining particulars of this institution. In short, the Church of England never took Tradition at all into consideration on the subject in question. The same may be said of it with respect to Baptism. The

* Doctor Milner says, “that Christ enjoined this ceremony with the utmost strictness, and that Protestants in rejecting it are guided by tradition.” But this is not the fact. The Church of England perceived that there was no command given on the subject, and that our Saviour only professed to set an example, as may be collected from John, xiii. 15; where he says, “I have given you an *example*,” &c. This clearly shews, from the *nature* of the thing, that he did not intend that it should be strictly followed.

manner of using the water, whether by **immersion*, or *aspersion*, is set forth in the Rubrics; while an indifference is observed about the quantity or quality. But our Church retains the use of water generally, which alone, with the prescribed form of words, is *essential* to Baptism as a Sacrament, and is also an unalterable circumstance attending it.

Doctor Milner admits, that our Saviour instituted the Eucharist under *two* kinds; but that † “he then made it a *sacrifice*, as well as a sacrament; that he ordained Priests, namely his twelve Apostles, to consecrate the one, and to offer up the other; that, for the purpose of making it a sacrifice, the *victim* should be really present, and, at least, mystically immolated; and that this is effected in the Mass, by the separate consecration of the elements; and finally, that to complete the sacrifice, the Priests, who had immolated the victim, should consummate it in both kinds, agreeably to the divine precept, which was addressed to the Apostles as Priests, and *not* to the laity as communicants.” Thus does this gentleman prepare his reader for what he has to advance in support of a practice in the Church of Rome, which ex-

* Our Church, at its own *discretion*, directs in its Baptismal Rubrics to “*dip* the child in the water discreetly,” &c.; or “*to pour* the water upon it;” according to circumstances.

† LETTER XXXIX. p. 63.

cludes its laity from an essential part of Christ's ordinance; and both in his present and * former publications, assert, that it has been from the apostolic age "a mere matter of *changeable* discipline:" whereas he sees it to be so intimately connected with the lofty pretensions of his Church; with her doctrines of Transubstantiation and Infallibility; and with her consequent desire to exalt the priesthood at the expense of the laity—that he could not give up a part without abandoning the whole. In order, therefore, to decide the question at issue, I shall, in the progress of the discussion, state the respective doctrines of the Churches of England and Rome, not on the authority of individuals, but on that of their official declarations.

It would appear, that our blessed Lord Himself laid greater emphasis on the participation of the cup, by enjoining them *all* to drink of it, than on that of the bread, which he distributed, not with a general injunction, such as "take you *all* and eat;" but with this simple precept, "take, eat." If St. Matthew reports him to have said, "drink ye *ALL* of this;" St. Mark relates that "they *all* drank of it;" which shews the strict observance of the command, and the importance attached to it in the minds of the

* Viz. LETTERS to a Prebendary, p. 110; and INQUIRY, &c. p. 147.

Apostles : an importance which they evidently did not attribute to the receiving of the bread. So that, in their narrative, they appear to have been under the unerring guidance of the Holy Spirit Himself, who, in His infinite wisdom, foresaw the errors and abuses, which were to arise in His Church in after-ages, in this particular, as if with a view to their prevention.

But the Church of Rome has its strong reasons to advance for so wide a departure from the letter and spirit of the divine command. These also I shall state with fairness and candour, after I have made some observations preparatory to their introduction; and then proceed to advance proofs, which will appear *no less* strong because of their being supported by Scripture and the usage of the primitive Church: * “ *that the cup of the Lord ought to be ministered to ALL Christian men alike.*”

Two centuries, at least, before the doctrine of Communion in one kind became established by a decree of a general council as a tenet of the Romish Church, it began to be agitated by the clergy. Towards the middle of the thirteenth century, Aquinas, so distinguished for his scholastic subtleties, reduced it to a tangible shape, and first proposed the question, as a subject of disputation; viz. † “ whether it were

* Article xxx.

† Utrum liceat sumere corpus Christi sine sanguine - - - -

allowable to take the body of Christ, *without* the blood, as it was customary with *many* Churches to do so." Yet, at the same time, he admitted, that * "according to the custom of the *ancient* Church, all persons, as they partook of the body, so they also *partook of the blood.*" Thus it appears, that the innovation was gradual in its progress, from the first faint mention of it in the schools, until it was finally ratified by the Council of Constance, A. D. 1414. However, this very Council itself, which first commanded the partial administration of the Sacrament, decreed, under pain of excommunication, † "that though Christ instituted and administered this venerable Sacrament to his disciples *in both kinds* of bread and wine, and though it was received in both kinds in the primitive Church, by the faithful, yet, that this custom was fitly introduced for the *avoidance* of some dangers and indecencies." But, notwithstanding this acknowledgment, it grounds its decree

ut erat *multarum ecclesiarum* usus.—THOM. AQUIN., pars iii. Qu. 80. Art. 12.

* Secundum *antiquæ Ecclesiæ* consuetudinem, omnes sicut communicabant corpore, ita et *communicabant sanguine.*—IBID.

† Licet Christus post cœnam *instituerit*, et suis discipulis administravit et sub *utrâque* specie panis et vini hoc venerabile Sacramentum - - - - - et in *primitivâ ecclesiâ* hujusmodi Sacramentum *reciperetur a fidelibus* SUB UTRAQUE SPECIE, tamen hæc consuetudo ad *evitandum* aliqua pericula et scandala, est rationabiliter introducta.—CONCIL. CONSTANT. Sess. 13.

neither on Scripture, nor Tradition. The *sic volo* of the Council nullifies a divine command, while its authority abolishes a long established usage. About the middle of the following century the Council of Trent further sanctioned this sacrilegious act, and, like its predecessor, without appealing either *to Scripture*, or *Tradition*, rested its decision on its own *unsupported* authority. * “Wherefore,” says their decree, “holy mother Church, acknowledging *its own* authority in the administration of the Sacraments; and although from the commencement of the Christian religion, *the use of it under BOTH kinds was not infrequent*; yet that the custom having now widely changed in the lapse of time, the Church, induced by just and grave causes, has approved and decreed as a law, the custom of communicating under *one* kind.” Here is an admission of the FREQUENCY (*non infrequens usus*) of the administration of the Sacrament in *both* kinds in the primitive Church; yet so guarded is the expression by the context, that the reader is led to infer, that the common practice was administration under *one* kind, and that the use of both kinds was the *excep-*

* Quare, agnoscens sancta mater ecclesia hanc suam in administratione Sacramentorum *auctoritatem*, licet ab initio Christianæ religionis non *infrequens* utriusque speciei *usus* fuisset - - - - hanc consuetudinem sub *alterâ* specie communicandi approbavit.—SESS. xxi. Canon ii. p. 204.

tion, contrary to what was the fact. The council further declares, * “ that although our Redeemer instituted this Sacrament *under two kinds*, in that last Supper, and gave it to the Apostles; nevertheless, it must be allowed, that the *whole* and *entire* Christ, and a true Sacrament is received, even under *one* kind only.” From this extract it appears that the assumption implied by the words *fatendum esse* is gratuitous, and that the only reason assigned for its decision, is the mere *placuit Ecclesiæ*.

If we now compare the following passage of the decree made at the THIRTEENTH Session, relative to Transubstantiation, with the last cited one of the TWENTY-FIRST Session, we shall see the glaring inconsistency, which exists between the two declarations. It says, (see page 116,) † “ that by the consecration of bread and wine a conversion or change takes place of *all* the substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of our Lord Jesus

* Quamvis Redemptor noster, hoc Sacramentum in *duabus speciebus* instituerit, et Apostolis tradiderit, tamen *fatendum esse* etiam sub *alterâ* tantum specie, *totum* atque *integrum* Christum, verumque Sacramentum sumi.—*IBID.*

† “ Per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri *totius* substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini Nostri, et *totius* substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus, quæ conversio convenienter et proprie a sanctâ Catholicâ Ecclesiâ *Transubstantiatio* est appellata.”—*SESS. xiii. chap. 4.*

Christ; and of *all* the substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood, which conversion is properly called *Transubstantiation*, by the Catholic Church." According to this, the *bread alone* becomes the *Body* of Christ; it being declared, that there is a *total* and *entire* change of the bread into the substance of *His Body*; it cannot, therefore, for a moment be supposed, that there is a conversion of *any* the smallest part of the bread into *any other* substance, as for instance, into that of the *Blood*: consequently, to receive the Bread, is to receive the Body of Christ, and the Body *only*—a conclusion quite at variance with the decree relative to half communion, which says that the receiving of the *bread alone* is the receiving of *both* Body and Blood!

So, in like manner, respecting the wine. Its conversion is declared, as above, to be *wholly* changed into the Blood of Christ, and into the Blood *only*; for so *totius substantiæ* implies. Accordingly, to receive the consecrated wine is literally (*vere, realiter, et substantialiter*) to receive the Blood of Christ. But here again, the decree on communion under *one* kind, declares the receiving of the wine *alone*, to be the receiving of *both* Body and Blood! This betrays the same inconsistency as the former case, as well as the weakness of the pretensions to "inerrancy" set up by Popish writers, in behalf

of the decisions of the Council of Trent. For, were it, as Doctor Milner says, "inerrant," how could the *twenty-first* Session, under Pius IV., have so completely overlooked the letter and spirit of the decree passed by the *thirteenth* Session, under Julius III.? Though the Body and Blood of Christ, therefore, should be received under *one* kind; yet as * Durandus says, "since the Blood is not eaten, nor the Body drank, so *neither* is drank under the species of bread, nor eaten under the species of wine." To receive the eucharistic elements sacramentally there must be eating and drinking, as both those acts belong to the Sacrament; but, this could not be the case, if either the bread or the wine were *alone* administered. To such inconsistency and error, the CHURCH OF ENGLAND opposes her xxxth Article, founded on the Institution of Christ Himself, as well as on the practice of the apostolic, and the succeeding ages of the primitive Church.

Various reasons have been assigned for the practice of denying the cup to the laity, some of which are futile in the extreme, others little founded in fact. Bellarmine alleges as an ex-

* Quia sicut nec sanguis comeditur, nec corpus bibitur; ita *neutrum* sub specie panis bibitur, aut sub specie vini comeditur.—DURAND, Rational. lib. iv. c. 42.

cuse, * “ that the inconvenience became more and more apparent as the multitude of communicants increased, and so *the custom* of communicating under both species gradually *ceased*.” And Bona admits, † “ that from the origin of the Church to the twelfth age, Christians at *all times* and *in every place*, communicated under the species of *bread* and *wine*.” Such are the admissions of two of the most eminent writers of the Romish Church, in the seventeenth century; both cardinals and nearly contemporaries. Some also of its advocates say, that the Sacrament was *partially* administered in *every* age of the Church, and that it was *optional* with the communicants to receive either or both kinds; others, that the cup was withheld to avoid the *risk* of spilling the wine; or the *indecentcy*, which arose by the communicants dipping their beards in it; or probably to *accommodate* the custom to countries not productive of wine; or lest the wine kept for the sick should turn sour; or lest some persons should not be able to bear its smell or taste. Trifling as these

* “ Crescente autem multitudine magis et magis apparuit incommodum, et sic paulatim *desiit* usus sub utrâque specie.”
DE EUCHAR. lib. iv. c. 4.

† “ *Semper enim et ubique* ab Ecclesiæ primordiis usque ad sæculum duodecimum, sub specie *panis et vini* communicârunt.”—BONA, Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. 18.

excuses are; yet it may be easily conceived that a dark and superstitious age would have recourse to them to justify a departure from primitive usage. The doctrine of Transubstantiation had taught them, that the sacramental bread and wine, were actually converted into the real Body and Blood of Christ; and the apprehensions, that any part of them should be lost or wasted, produced, as its natural consequence, the practice of denying the cup to the laity. Expedients were adopted to prevent this loss and waste; the bread was administered in the form of wafers, and the wine conveyed through *tubes into the mouths of the communicants. The bread was even steeped in wine as a preventive of accidents; still as they occurred, it was finally agreed on, that the officiating priest *only* should partake of both kinds. From a consideration of all the reasons taken together, two are discoverable as influencing the Church of Rome in this decision: *one*, that the cup is *superfluous* and *not an essential part* of the Sacrament, as the *totus et integer Christus* is contained in the transubstantiated bread; and *the other*, that the Commu-

* The Pope's practice of drinking the wine through a gold pipe, *chalanceau d'or*, (termed by Cassander, *pugillaris*,) is circumstantially related in PICART's Ceremonial of High Mass.—Religieuses Cérémonies des Cathol. Rom., vol. i. p. 94.

nion in one kind has been established by *its own* authority, which is necessarily paramount to Scripture itself! Such are the reasons assigned for this sacrilegious practice by the supporters of the doctrine; but whether they be weighty and just ones, (*graves et justæ*,) as the decree professes, the reader may judge.

But let us hear Doctor Milner's scriptural justification of the practice of half communion.

1. * "Our Saviour," says he, "after his resurrection, *took bread, and blessed and brake*, and gave it to them, LUKE, xxiv. 30, which shews he communicated them under the form of bread alone. 2. That it is recorded in the ACTS, ii. 42, that the baptized converts at Jerusalem continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, and fellowship, and *in breaking of bread and prayer*. 3. And again, upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, ACTS, xx. 7, without any mention of the other species; which circumstances prove, that the Apostles were *accustomed* to give the Sacrament under *one* kind alone." A little consideration will shew, what a weak sanction those passages afford Doctor Milner's doctrine. For, extraordinary as it would be in the Apostles, on the first occasion of their administering the Sacrament, (taking for granted that it was the

* LETTER xxxix. p. 65.

sacramental bread, which was broke at their meetings on the Lord's day,) to depart from Christ's Institution, and to violate his command about it; it would be much more strange, that Christ himself should, on the day of his resurrection, give the Sacrament in a manner different from what he had done three days previously.

It is true, that the words quoted in the *first* text are the same as those which occur in the account given of the last Supper; but although they be, it does not hence follow, that Christ distributed the Sacrament as often as he took bread, and blessed and brake it, and gave it to others. For thus, it would have been a Sacrament, when on one occasion, he performed the astonishing miracle of feeding five thousand with five loaves, and two fishes; as he then looked up to heaven, and * “*blessed and brake the loaves and gave them to his disciples.*” St. Mark records, that our Saviour acted in a like manner on a similar occasion, when he filled the multitude of four thousand with seven loaves; for † “*He took them and gave thanks and brake and gave to his disciples, to set before them.*” If then, it must be conceded Doctor Milner, that Christ administered the Sacrament at Emmaus, on the day of His Resurrection; it must be done, not only, without any authority, but

* Mark, vi. 41, and Matt. xiv. 19.

† Mark, viii. 6.

without any reason. *To break bread* was a phrase familiar to the Jews, and implied the distribution of it, and though singly expressed here, it means nothing more than that He sat at meat with them; His object being, that they should be satisfied with the truth of His Resurrection.

As to the *second* and *third* texts, what more can they imply, than that those meetings were designed for the purpose of prayer and refreshment in the same house, and that an eucharistic form of words, similar to our *Grace* at the time of eating, was adopted by those assembled? All kinds of food essential to life have, in all countries, been signified by BREAD; thus, when we pray for our “daily bread,” we surely mean more, than that single article of nourishment. And when * “Christ went into the house of one of the Chief Pharisees *to eat bread* on the Sabbath day,” it is to be inferred, that he intended to drink also. When Joseph’s brethren † “heard that they should *eat bread* with him,” they must have expected also to be regaled with drink. But, in addition to the second and third texts, I shall supply Doctor Milner with a *fourth* to the same effect. ‡ “And they breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.” His motive

* LUKE, xiv. 1.

† GENESIS, xliii. 25.

‡ ACTS, ii. 46.

in overlooking this text, although only three verses intervened between it and one of those cited by him, and although the act, by which he would establish his Half-Communion, viz. the breaking of bread, is expressed in it also; is very evident. On the whole, therefore, we cannot but perceive, from the frequent use of this Hebrew idiom, that to *break bread* directs the mind to its correlative act, that of drinking. Otherwise, if the texts produced prove Communion in one kind, they prove too much for Doctor Milner's purpose; for they prove, that there was consecration only in *one* kind, and reception in *one* kind, even by the Priest who consecrated! But this is contrary to what he says about the injunction, *drink ye all of this*, regarding "the Apostles as *Priests*, and *not* the laity as communicants."

Doctor Milner next adduces what he considers a still more important passage for Communion in *either* kind; where the Apostle says, * "Whosoever shall eat this Bread, or drink this Chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord." In his observations on this text, he says, † "that the REV. MR. GRIER, who has *attempted* to vindicate the purity of the English Protestant Bible, has *nothing else* to say for this alteration

* 1 COR. xi. 27. Rhem. Transl.

† LETTER xxxix: p. 65!

of St. Paul's Epistle, than in what he *falsely* calls the parallel texts of Luke and Matthew, the conjunctive *and* occurs."

My ANSWER to Ward's Errata of our Received English Version of the Bible was occasioned by the re-publication of that mischievous production, enlarged as it was by matter most highly offensive to our Established Clergy, by, it is supposed, Mr. Lingard. As it appeared to me a new proof of the rancorous disposition of Popery, I spared no pains to repel the foul accusations which it contained. But the readers of that ANSWER are competent to decide how far "*my attempt*" to defend the purity of that Version has been successful. To their opinion I respectfully defer. It is not for me to go farther than to say, that, while I feel myself sustained by the approbation of some of the most eminent among the English and Irish Prelates, and many other characters distinguished for their learning and talents, as well as by the consciousness of having performed a duty; I can have no great difficulty, either in reconciling myself to Doctor Milner's displeasure for what I *have* done, or in calling it down on me hereafter with aggravated force for what I *now* do.

However, to return to the subject more immediately under consideration. Doctor Milner alleges my inability to state *any other* ground

for “the alteration” in St. Paul’s Epistle, than what is “*falsely*” called the parallel texts of Luke and Matthew, in which the conjunctive *and* occurs. To me, there does not appear a more decisive way of ascertaining the sense in which the Greek particle *καὶ* should be taken, than by those very parallel passages to which he objects. In * one of them, St. Luke says, “by what authority doest thou these things? *or*, who gave thee this authority?” And, in the † other, St. Matthew repeats, “by what authority doest thou these things? *and* who gave thee this authority?” The passages in the original are critically the same, with the exception of the *καὶ* and *καί*; while the translation of those two words correspond in the Protestant and Rhe-mish Versions. So that, if due regard be had to the genius of the Greek language, as well as to the import of the questions asked, it is impossible for any sound or unprejudiced critic to deny, that the *καί* determines the sense of the *καὶ*, rather than the *καὶ* that of the *καί*; particularly as there are two distinct questions asked, one relating to the *thing*—namely, the authority; and the other to the *person*, in the pronoun *who*.

But had St. Paul, in the circumstantial ‡ account which he gives of the Lord’s Supper, and of its commemorative tendency, introduced

* Chap. xx. 2. † Chap. xxi. 23. ‡ 1 Cor. xi. 26—29.

* instead of καί, into the 26th verse, and said, “as often as ye eat this bread, (η) or drink this cup,” as he does into the one in question; and had he again used the η in the 28th verse, and not the καί; and had he moreover introduced it *twice* into the 29th verse, as thus, “for he that eateth, (η) or drinketh unworthily, eateth or drinketh damnation to himself,” instead of inserting a καί in *each* place. Had St. Paul, I repeat it, introduced the disjunctive into the *four* places, which I have enumerated, as he did (and let it be remembered, that he has done so only *once*) into the 27th verse; or, had he even introduced it into *two* of the four passages, that read καί; as this would give the greater number of readings favourable to the Rhemish Version of the η in the 27th verse: I do conceive, that the sticklers for that Version would have the argument for Communion under one kind decidedly in their favour, *quoad* the same 27th verse, and partially so in the latter. But, how they can bend the signification of the η, (which is, on all hands, admitted to be variable, like the Hebrew particle ו,) from the conjunctive meaning, and do this contrary to the legitimate rules of criticism, which require the sense of the * fewer passages to be regulated by that of the greater number, is most unaccountable. It is equally

* “Oportet secundum plura intelligi pauciora.”—TERTUL. adv. Hæret.

so, even on their own principles, by any possibility, * “to shew forth the Lord’s death,” except we both “eat of that bread and drink of that cup.” Indeed, of the two, the taking of the cup is more strongly enforced than that of the other. It is called, † the Cup of the New Testament in His blood, as if in it consisted the very essence of the New Covenant; and the injunction, ‡ “drink ye *all* of this,” is used, as if to obviate the supposition, that some might *omit*, or be *denied* it.

Should Doctor Milner refer to Rosenmüller, on whose authority I relied, when preparing my ANSWER to Ward for publication; he must admit, how well I was supported by that author in my exposition of $\eta \pi \omega \eta$; although I barely adverted to him at the time. His excellent comment runs thus, § “as to the particle η (in the words $\eta \pi \omega \eta$) it is without reason, that the Papists rely upon it, as shewing that both species are not absolutely necessary. For, first, there is a variety of reading, (as some use $\kappa \alpha \iota$) and also, it is very common with the Greek interpreters of the O. T. to put $\kappa \alpha \iota$ for η , as in GEN. iii. 22; Symmachus has $\kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \nu \eta \pi \omega \eta \rho \omega \nu$, and other translators, $\kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \nu \kappa \alpha \iota \pi \omega \eta \rho \omega \nu$. Besides this, any one of the Corinthians might take the cup

* 1 Cor. xi. 27.

† Luke, xxii. 20.

‡ Matt. xxvi. 27.

§ Rosen. vol. iv. p. 151.

unworthily, as *by drinking of it to intoxication*, although in eating no indecency had been committed." From the clear manner in which this commentator states the subject, it is surprising that any difficulty should arise about it. Two things are proposed to be done, and both guilt and consequent punishment are to be incurred by the non-performance of either. It is further to be observed, respecting the variety of reading in the old Greek copies alluded to by Rosenmüller, that * Griesbach presents his reader with no less than fifteen MSS., including the Alexandrine and Clermont ones, which have *καί*. † Wolff also, another learned collator, enumerates no fewer than thirty of the oldest copies of the VULGATE, in which *et* is the translation of *καί*. The objection, I should observe, which is made to the translation of this particle in the Protestant Bible, is far from being *new*; it is quite traditional, being as old as the Reformation itself. It was first started by Gregory Martin, and from him transmitted by Harding and Ward to the present age, and has now acquired fresh vigour for further transmission from Doctor Milner's pen. The specimen of scholarship connected with it distinctly shews, that there has been no advance whatever in Scrip-

* NOV. TEST. GRÆC. vol. ii. p. 265.

† CURÆ PHILOLOG. vol. iii. p. 492.

ture criticism among Roman Catholic divines for the last three centuries; and, if the progressive growth of Biblical learning, and the vast accessions which have been made to it by Protestant writers within that period, be taken into account, the Popish Church will have appeared to retrograde in this particular, and to be now sunk into a state comparatively more degraded, than what it had been in, at the commencement of the Reformation.

Jewell's * REPLY to Harding is likewise very much to the point, and contains such forcible reasoning, and unanswered, because unanswerable, argument; that I cannot forbear pressing Doctor Milner with it in the present instance. The Bishop, after some pointed animadversions on Harding, proceeds to say, †“ that *sometimes disjunctives stand instead of copulatives, sometimes copulatives instead of disjunctives*. But if he have so good an eye to one little disjunctive, and mean uprightly, why doth he so blindly pass by so many copulatives in the selfsame place altogether?” From every view of the case, therefore, which I have been able to take of it, and after the most deliberate consideration of the arguments advanced on both sides, I find

* P. 95.

† “ Sæpe ita comparatum est, ut et disjuncta pro conjunctis accipiantur, et conjuncta pro disjunctis.”—*De verb. et rer. significatione*.—IBID.

so many, and such convincing ones *for* its being AND; and so many *against* its being OR, that a shadow of doubt does not remain on my own mind of the correctness of the former version. The similarity of the cases is so striking, that I cannot here resist admonishing Doctor Milner in the language of rebuke addressed by Doctor Kilbie to the young preacher, as * before related.

It was reserved for the Doctors of the Popish Church to make a discovery, which escaped the acuteness of the primitive Christians—that a thing is different from itself. This appears in reference to the Eucharist, which Doctor Milner says, was made “a SACRIFICE, as well as a *Sacrament*.” A *Sacrament* to those who communicate in one kind, and a SACRIFICE to the officiating priest, who in offering it receives both bread and wine. On this very principle Pope Pius V., in his instructions to parish priests, observes, that although the Eucharist is always a SACRIFICE after consecration, yet that it *does not continue* one, as when it is brought to the sick, or kept in the pyx (*dum in pyxide continetur*), it is then only a *Sacrament*. Moreover, he says, † “as a *Sacrament* it brings with

* See p. 97.

† “Ut Sacramentum est meriti *causam* affert; ut autem sacrificium est, non merendi solum *satisfaciendi quoque efficaciam* continet.”—Sect. 78.

it the ground of merit; but as a SACRIFICE it *satisfies* for sin." Reader, observe, that as the *Sacramental* merits are here distinguished from the SACRIFICIAL ones, they must necessarily be unconnected with those of Christ!

This is a refined distinction, no doubt, and one, although beyond ordinary conception, for which Bellarmine assigns as a reason, * "that it is chiefly done for the *integrity* of the Sacrifice, and not of the Sacrament." I the more readily adduce the Cardinal's words, because Doctor Milner leaves us in the dark as to the grounds of the distinction being evidently aware that any attempt at explanation would but involve the subject in greater obscurity. The learned Usher, after incontestably proving that the *Sacrifice* of the primitive Christians was every way unlike that in the Church of Rome; and that in their use of the Sacrament, they received both the bread and wine, concludes with saying, that they knew *no* difference between the *Sacrifice* and the *Sacrament*: † "for, that they were not *so acute* as to discern between the things that belonged unto the *integrity* of the Sacrifice and of the Sacrament, because, in very truth, *they took the one to be the other.*"

* "Id fit potissimum ob Sacrificii, non ob Sacramenti *integritatem.*"—DE SACRAM. EUCH. lib. iv. c. 22, in fine.

† Abp. Usher's DISCOURSE on the Religion anciently professed by the Irish.—c. iv. p. 36.

From this fanciful distinction, Doctor Milner proceeds to say, * “ that the command of Christ, on which our opponents lay so much stress, *drink ye all of this*, regards the Apostles as *priests*, and not the laity as communicants.” Bossuet’s language is the same, as is that of Boileau; we may therefore take it to express the sentiments of the Popish Church in general. The latter remarks, † “ that the words of the command respect *no man* whatsoever, but the twelve Apostles.” Now, according to this, the Apostles, and the Apostles only, *without reference* to succession in the ministry, were enjoined to drink the cup; an inference, which is every whit as defensible, as that the Apostles only drank it *in the capacity* of priests. But this difficulty is got over by their considering the Apostles in a twofold light: one, as representing all Christian priests by their participation of the cup; and the other, as representing all the laity, by their participation of the bread. So then, according to the reasoning of the Popish Doctors themselves; the Apostles, who sat down with Christ to celebrate his last supper as laymen, and who, as laymen, partook of the bread, were instantaneously impressed with

* LETTER XXXIX. p. 63.

† “ Igitur hæc verba, bibite ex hoc omnes, *neminem* præter duodecim Apostolos spectant aut attinent.”—Boileau. De Præcep. Divin. p. 188.

the indelible character of the priesthood, by virtue of the words, *hoc facite*, which were spoken to them after he had given them the bread. Hence, also, it inevitably follows, that Christ appointed at his last supper, not one alone, but *two* of their Sacraments, that of *Orders*, as well as the *Eucharist*. But, unfortunately for them, this new character would in this case be too hastily acquired; for, as yet, they were not constituted pastors of his Church, as Christ had not, until after his resurrection, * “breathed on them,” nor imparted to them the Holy Spirit. Besides, there was the absence of every form peculiar to an occasion of the kind; for neither word nor action purported any thing like ordination. The injunction “DO THIS,” also followed without interruption, the words, TAKE, EAT, THIS IS MY BODY. So that, whether Christ gave the bread to each of them separately, or whether they took it as it lay on the table, the expression DO THIS must have been uttered *before* they received it. Wherefore, it is as natural to suppose that the Apostles eat the bread *as priests*, as that they drank the wine as such; a supposition that will go to take away the bread, and, by consequence, the *entire* Sacrament from the people, and thus make it, as some of the Jewish Sacri-

* JOHN, XX. 22.

fices were, *peculiar* to the priests. On the whole, therefore, the matter is reduced to this alternative; if the effect and virtue of the Sacrament depend on Christ's institution, then *both* bread and wine are essentially necessary: but, if the effect and virtue may be had without adhering to the institution, then *neither* is so. The Sacrifice of the Mass, ideal manducation, or some other substitute, need only be provided, and *both* the symbols, as much as *one*, may be dispensed with.

Again: not one of the fathers, who have written on the Sacrament, ever entertained such a notion, as that the Apostles were made **PRIESTS** by the words **hoc facite*; or, that they received the cup only as such. Even some Popish writers are unwilling to adopt this sophistical evasion, such as Suarez and Alfonsus a Castro; while † Estius admits, that *hoc facite* refers to the common people *eating and drinking* this Sacrament. In making this

* The observance of the command is imperative on all Christians, unless we say with some Socinians, that the Sacrament was a mere temporary rite, which *exclusively* belonged to the Apostles; but which was neither to continue in the Church, nor be observed in all future ages.—See **DISCOURSES** on Atonement *passim*, and **PRESERV.** against Pop., Tit. vii. p. 106.

† “ Et Paulus, 1 Cor. xi. illud facere etiam ad plebem refert edentem et bibentem de hoc Sacramento, quando ait, hoc facite quotiescunque.”—See Pol. Synops. in loc.

admission, he judged wisely, being aware of the difficulty, which would arise, whenever the use of the cup was allowed, should he, like Doctor Milner, have asserted, that Christ's command regarded the Apostles *as Priests*, and not the laity as communicants. For, on this principle, those very instances of special favour, which the Doctor speaks of, as being shewn to the Hussites, the Emperor Ferdinand, the Kings of France, and the monastic order of Cluni, by the Church of Rome, in conceding to them the use of the cup, are but so many condemning proofs of the inconsistency of that Church.

But further ; if, as Doctor Milner says, the command regards the Apostles *as Priests*, why is there so glaring a contradiction between the Popish practice and its profession, as that the *Minister conficiens*, the Priest who consecrates, let ever so many Priests be present, is the only one, who receives the cup ? If the Apostles received the cup as Priests, and that they represented the Christian priesthood *in æternum* ; why should not all the attendant Priests enjoy the privilege as well as the consecrator ? But, if he be the only one to partake of the cup, for no other Priest would dare incur the * anathema ;

* “ Si quis dixerit, sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam *non justis* causis et rationibus adductam fuisse, ut laicos atque etiam clericos *non conficientes*, sub *pams tantummodo* specie commu-

then, by this rule, the Apostles *should not have received it* at the Institution, as they did not consecrate! On that occasion, Christ was the *Minister conficiens*, and accordingly, He *only*, and not the Apostles, should have received it.

Again, as it is most probable, that Christ Himself received neither the bread nor the wine, the Tridentine Synod, should, agreeably to their principle, have laid it down, that the *Minister conficiens* was not to receive at all, but to consecrate, and to give to the other Priests who were present! But moreover, if the Apostles were made Priests by the words * *hoc facite*, then they were made Priests *twice* at that time; since our Saviour uttered those words, not only after he gave the bread, but likewise after he administered the wine; and had thus not only imparted to them a *double* consecration, but a two-fold impression of the sacerdotal character! Thus we see what a string of absurd, contradictory, and inconsistent conclusions we arrive at, in arguing from Doctor Milner's assumption to the basis of it—the fore-mentioned decree of the Council of Trent.

I should not omit to state, that Doctor Mil-

nicaret, aut in eo errasse; ANATHEMA SIT."—Trid. Concil. Sess. xxi. Can. 2.

* *Facere* has been made to signify, *to sacrifice*.—See PRESERV. against Popery, Tit. vii. p. 109.

ner introduces Barclay, the acute Apologist of the Quakers, as observing how inconclusively Protestants argue from the words of the Institution. This animadversion is of course rendered available to the Popish cause. Nothing indeed, was more natural, than that Barclay, as the defender of Mysticism, should find fault both with the *time* and *manner* of eating the sacramental bread, and therefore, that he should, in the spirit of cavil, apply the words DO THIS, not merely to the *taking* and *eating* the bread; but likewise to the *blessing* and *breaking* it at supper. But, if his argument have any force, it is applicable to every denomination of Christians, * “who” as he says, “have not yet obeyed this precept, nor fulfilled this Institution.” Barclay, after noticing the differences between the Lutherans, who used the unleavened, and the Calvinists, who used the leavened bread; then says, † “that by these uncertainties, the *Protestants*, (observe, he means particularly the Lutherans and Calvinists, with whom Doctor Milner as usual confounds the members of the Church of England) *open a door to the Papists* for their excluding the people from the cup, and that they are no more justified in dispensing with the *manner* and *time*

* Barclay's Apology for the Quakers, Prop. xiii. Sect. 7. p. 470.

† *IBID.*

in which Christ performed the sacramental act, *than the Papists are to dispense with the other.*"

He then asks, as Doctor Milner states, how Protestants ascertain from the words DO THIS, the respective part which both Clergy and Laity are required to take on the occasion? But, for the avoidance of this uncertainty, he recommends them * "no longer to cling superstitiously to this ceremony, but to *lay it aside*, as they have done others of a like nature." These last words distinctly shew the object which Barclay had in view. They are such as are natural for a writer of his class to use, who attached every importance to the inward operations of the spirit, and *none* to the outward signs of the Sacraments. But for Doctor Milner to quote them as authority against the faith and practice of the Church of England, respecting the Eucharist, is passing strange; inasmuch as Barclay's arguments come with redoubled force against the Church of Rome: witness what he says about Protestants *opening a door* to the Papists for excluding the people from the cup, &c. &c.

Doctor Milner again produces the fathers to prove that † "from the Apostolic age, the Church regarded half-communion as a mere

* IBID.

† LETTER XXXIX. p. 66. See also his INQUIRY, p. 147.

matter of variable discipline." Tertullian, who stands foremost on his list, does certainly state, that the primitive Christians, after they had partaken of the holy Sacrament, carried some home and preserved it for private communion; but this they did, for reasons and under circumstances very different from those assigned by Doctor Milner. The storm of persecution, which consigned thousands of the unoffending Christians to torture and to death, during the reigns of Nero and Domitian, continued to rage with unabated fury in the second century also, under Adrian and Marcus Aurelius. * Mosheim informs us of the sanguinary laws, which were enforced against them, and † Gibbon himself, who never loses an opportunity of sneering at the *popular superstition*, proclaims their hardships; for that none *except themselves* experienced the injustice of Marcus. In those periods, therefore, of which Tertullian is the historian, and in the reign of this Emperor, of whom he was a contemporary, the Christians seldom met for the purpose of devotion, and then only by night;—witness their antelucan assemblies, of which ‡ Pliny the younger speaks.

* Eccl. Hist. vol. i. p. 157. et seq.

† "Marcus," says Gibbon, "despised the Christians as a philosopher, and *punished* them as a Sovereign."—DECLINE AND FALL, vol. ii. p. 446.

‡ EPIST. ad Traj.

Can it then be wondered at, that they should cherish and preserve what was so precious to them, and which sustained them under their afflictions?

Let it then be conceded to Doctor Milner, that the Sacrament was taken home, and that those who partook of it in a secret manner enjoyed a perfect Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ; still, what advantage would he derive from the concession, unless he could prove, that after the faithful had communicated in both kinds publicly, they had carried home and reserved only *one* species for private Communion. * Bossuet, where he treats of this very subject, admits, that the faithful were allowed to take away the *Blood* also, if they required it; but that they were not anxious for the wine, as it could not be preserved for any length of time *without change*. This may be Doctor Milner's opinion too; but experience proves how erroneous it is, as the bread suffers from length of time sooner than the wine. The fact is, they took home not *one*, but *both* species; and this appears on the evidence of Tertullian himself. Bossuet grants this also, but says, that it was done immediately after consecration; as if it made any difference, whether it was soon or not, when the question at issue is, whether

* DE COMMUN. p. 112.

† IBID p. 113.

the primitive Christians preserved the blessed Sacrament, as Doctor Milner insists, under the form of *Bread only* for private Communion. But, to come to the point respecting Tertullian's testimony. This father, speaking of the resurrection, says, * “our flesh is fed with *the Body and Blood* of Christ.” And in his Address to his wife, to which Doctor Milner particularly alludes, he urges her, in two separate places, † *to take the cup*, with earnestness of soul; which proves, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was received, in his time, under *both* kinds.

St. Cyprian and St. Dennis of Alexandria come next in succession; but their evidence is of the same general nature and tendency as that of Tertullian. The ‡ former pleads for giving the Communion to the *lapsed*, in order to prepare them for further trials; while the latter barely relates, that Serapion, who had sacrificed to idols, prayed for the comfort of the Eucharist, as a token of reconciliation to the Church, when he found his end approaching; and that the priest sent him by the young man, who

* “*Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur.*”

† “*De cujus manu desiderabit? de cujus poculo participabit?*” And again—“*De cibo, de poculo invadere, desiderare, in mente habere.*”—*AD UXOR. Lib. ii. c. iv et vi.*

‡ See p. 160.

delivered the message, * “ a small portion (*βραχυ*) of the Eucharist, enjoining him *to moisten it*, and so to pour it into the old man's mouth.” But it is not to be inferred, because of the smallness of the quantity, that the bread only was sent. For *ευχαριστια* implies the sacramental food (*τροφη*) under *both* kinds, according to † Justin Martyr; while ‡ St. Jerome tells of the “ Body of our Lord being carried in a basket, and the *Blood* in a glass vessel, to relieve the poor.” So that we must conclude, that a small portion of *both* the bread and wine was sent, and that the injunction to moisten it (*|| αποβρεξαι*) before he put it into the mouth of the dying Serapion, related to his dipping the bread in the wine; a practice under the title of *INTINCTION*, well known in the early ages of the Church.

Descending the stream of time, I next accom-

* *Βραχυ της ευχαριστίας επιδωκεν τῷ παιδαριῷ, ΑΠΟΒΡΕΞΑΙ κειλευσας, και τῷ πρεσβυτῇ κατὰ τὸ σωματος ΕΠΙΣΤΑΞΑΙ.*—Lib. vi. c. 44. *apud Euseb.*

† *Και ἡ τροφή αὐτὴ καλεῖται παρ’ ἡμῖν ευχαριστία.*—JUST. MART. Apol. i. p. 95.

‡ “ Qui Corpus Domini canistro vimineo, Sanguinem portat in *vitro*.”—EPIST. ad Rustic. Monach.

|| BISHOP ANDREWS, in his Answer to Bellarmine, p. 192, contends, “ that the bread was not separately brought to Serapion; because the bread could not be said to be poured, certainly not to be *moistened* without something *liquid*. The Eucharist was, therefore, either mixed there, or reduced to a *liquid* state.”

pany Doctor Milner to the fourth century, when SS. Basil and Chrysostom flourished. The former says in the very epistle cited by the Doctor, * “ that it is good and profitable to partake every day of the blessed Body and *Blood* of Christ.” And where he treats of the peculiar virtues of Christians, he asks, † “ what is proper to those, that eat the bread and drink the *cup* of Christ?” As for the latter, he draws no distinction between the priest and the laity; when we come to ‡ “ partake of the divine mysteries, for we are ALL admitted to them alike.” And again, it was not lawful *under the old dispensation*, for the people to partake of the same things with the priest, but not so now, § “ for to ALL one body is offered, to ALL one cup.” Now is it possible to find language more adverse to Doctor Milner’s cause; or which expresses in more direct terms the usage of the Church in their days, respecting the Eucharist? I should add, that Justin Martyr also says expressly, that the deacons took *the wine*, as well as the

* Μιταλαμβάνειν τὴ ἁγίῃ αἵματος καὶ σώματος Χριστοῦ.—Epist. ad Cæsar.

† Τὶ ἰδίον τῶν ἰσθιοντῶν ἄρτον καὶ πινοντῶν ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ Τῆ ΘΕΟΥ.—IBID. Moral.

‡ Ὅμοιος γὰρ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ἀξιωμαθὰ τῶν αὐτῶν.—Tom. x. p. 560.

§ ΑΛΛΑ ΠΑΣΙΝ ἐν σῶμα προκίηται, καὶ τὸ ἐν ποτήριον.—IBID. Hom. xxiii. in 1 Cor.

bread to those **who were absent*, after they had distributed *both* elements to each person present.

As a further proof, that there was only communion in one kind in the primitive Church; Doctor Milner says, †“ that the blessed Sacrament was administered to mere *infants*, by a drop out of the Chalice,” and appeals to Cyprian’s authority in confirmation of this practice. The story told by that father relates to an infant, who after having taken bread and wine in a Pagan temple, was afterwards brought to a Christian assembly, where the priest forced a little of the wine into its mouth, when distributing the cup; a circumstance, which, if it prove any thing, proves too much:—namely, that as no mention is made of the bread, all present must necessarily have only received the *cup* !

The hacknied passages from the ordinances of LEO and GELASIUS, in support of half communion, are ‡reproduced by Doctor Milner as

* Διδοασιν εκασῳ των παροντων μεταλαβειν απο τη ευχαριστηει-
τος αρτη και οινῃ και ὑδατος, και τοις ΟΥ ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙΝ αποφερουσιν.
—APOL. 2.

† LETTER xxxix. p. 67.

‡ Harding the Jesuit, Bossuet, and last of all, Mr. Fletcher, urged the same authorities for half-communion; but they were met and successively refuted by Bishop Jewell, Mr. Payne, and the present Bishop of Durham.

though they had never before been so much as challenged. "On the same principle," says he, "that the Manichæan heretics at Rome objected to the sacramental cup, Pope Leo ordered them to be excluded the communion entirely." There is no doubt, that such an order was made; but no evidence is afforded by the document spoken of to prove, that it was the practice of the Church in Leo's time to distribute the bread *only*, or that the practice was to be varied on that occasion by the addition of the cup. The contrary appears to have been the case, and that it was the settled custom to receive the cup as well as the bread; otherwise, Leo would not have pointed out the *refusal* of those persons to partake of the wine as the surest mark of distinction between them and the orthodox; nor would he have been entirely silent on the subject, had it been an abolished or a suspended usage, which was, in this instance, restored for the purpose of exposing the heretics. He presses on the notice of his congregation the objections of those persons, * "that so they might by this evidence be discovered, and their sacrilegious dissimulation be detected." In a word, if the distribution of the cup were not an established ordinance of

* Sermon. iv. de Quadrag. p. 38.

the Church, why should he call the violation of it *sacrilegious*?

Doctor Milner next assumes, that the Christians of the fifth century were in the habit of communicating only in one kind, when he asserts, that “Pope Gelasius required all his flock to receive under both kinds.” But that this too is a gratuitous assumption, will appear by considering the words of the decree and the motive, which existed for his making it. He merely follows up the example set him by Leo, in excommunicating those superstitious persons who partook of the bread, but who declined the cup. This practice he also deemed *sacrilegious*, which is the only motive assigned for so rigid an exercise of his authority. “We find,” says he, “that some persons receiving only the portion of the sacred Body abstain from the sacred Cup,* who should, without doubt, either take the Sacraments entirely, or be wholly kept from them; because, *the division of one and the same Sacrament cannot take place WITHOUT GREAT SACRILEGE.*” Here we see, that the *sacrilegious* suppression of part of the Sacrament was the cause, and the *only* cause

* “Qui aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur, quia *divisio* unius ejusdemque mysterii sine *grandi sacrilegio*, non potest pervenire.”—GRATIAN. Decret. pars iii. dist. 2.

for passing the decree. But it does not hence follow, as Doctor Milner insinuates, that it was previously the practice to communicate in *one* kind alone. No. The decree was not made to regulate the practice of the faithful, but was levelled for the particular reason assigned, against the superstitious persons then at Rome. Cassander thought, and his authority should have great weight with Doctor Milner, that the testimonies of Leo and Gelasius, instead of favouring, *condemn* this practice. In reply to a half-communicant, he says, “that it is very evident, that, during their Pontificates, Communion in *both* kinds was usual in the Church; otherwise, how could the Manichæans be detected, unless the Cup of Christ’s Blood had been offered to *all* in the Church?” He then concludes with observing,* “that a new decree was not necessary for the Catholics, who religiously adhered to the established custom of receiving (*integra sacramenta*) the Sacrament in *both* kinds.” Thus it appears, that Communion in *one* kind was not the usage of the primitive Church, whether it regarded *domestic* purposes, the *sick*, or *infants*; that it is not countenanced by the decrees of Leo and Gelasius; and that the indulgence of a partial admini-

* “Nam Catholicis novo decreto non opus erat, qui receptam *integra sacramenta* percipiendi consuetudinem religiose servabant.”—De Commun. sub utrâque, p. 126.

stration of the Sacrament, in times of persecution and in cases of necessity, was no violation of the general rule.

From the fifth, Doctor Milner passes on, *per saltum*, to the usage of the twelfth century, when he says, * “ that only the officiating Priest and infants received under the form of wine, which discipline was confirmed at the beginning of the fifteenth century, by the Council of Constance, on account of the profanations and other evils resulting from the general reception of it in that form.” The reader has only to bear in mind, what I have proved to have been the practice of the Church, relative to the Eucharist, to the time of Gelasius, and also to take into account the total want of evidence to the point, from that period to the *twelfth* century; and he must conclude, that, before this latter period, there appears no authority to countenance the Popish *innovation*. The first attempt at a change in the important ordinance of the Lord’s Supper seems to have been made at that time, although Aquinas speaks of it in the thirteenth century, as being then only an incipient custom. † “ In *some* churches,” says he, “ it is observed, that the Priest alone partakes of the Blood, but *the rest* of the Body.” *In quibusdam, and in aliquibus Ecclesiis* shew,

* LETTER XXXIX. p. 67.

† COMMENT. in Johan. vi. 53.

that it was in his day very far from being a general observance in the Latin Churches.

The Council of Constance openly opposed its authority to that of the Divine Founder of the Institution. It set out with acknowledging, * “that Christ instituted and administered this blessed Sacrament to His disciples in *both* kinds of bread and wine and that in the primitive Church the faithful received it in *both* kinds; yet a practice being reasonably introduced to avoid *some dangers and scandals*, they appoint the custom of consecrating in *both* kinds, and of giving to the laity only in *ONE* kind; since Christ was truly and entire under *each* kind.” But this acknowledgment does not render the decree a whit the less reprehensible; and although the Council alleged some *pericula* and *scandala*, those weighty reasons, † already spoken of, as the grounds of its decision, yet the weakness and folly of such excuses betray themselves, when the magnitude and importance of the command, which is thereby violated, are considered. This was the feeling of Burnet on the subject, who ascribed this violation to Transubstantiation, as to the true cause from

* “*Licet* Christus post cœnam instituerit sub *utrâque* specie panis et vini hoc venerabile sacramentum Et in primitivâ Ecclesiâ ejusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub *utrâque* specie.”—CONCIL. CONSTANT. Sess. 12.

† See p. 202.

which it emanated, and by which the belief is inculcated, that * “as Christ was in *every* crumb of bread, it was thought *needless* to give the Sacrament in both kinds.”

As for the indulgence in the use of the cup, which, Doctor Milner says, was extended by the Popes to certain individuals in the sixteenth century, or to some of the regular orders of the Clergy, that goes for nothing, after the arbitrary proceeding of the Council of Constance; as the power which could bring itself to suspend or to abolish an established custom, in opposition to the concurring testimony of every ecclesiastical writer from the Apostolic age to that of Thomas Aquinas, and to the general usage of the primitive church, no less than to the Scriptures themselves; could feel little hesitation, about an occasional departure from its own decree.

Doctor Milner concludes his letter on this subject, with, what he calls, evidence, which, † “after all the Bishop of Durham’s Anathemas against his party, will demonstrate, either that the point at issue is a mere matter of discipline, or that the three principal denominations of Protestants are inconsistent with themselves.” His first reference is to Luther’s Let-

* HIST. OF THE REFORM. vol. ii. p. 42.

† LETTER xxxix. p. 68.

ter to Carlostad ; his next to the decree of the French Calvinists ; and his third to the separate English Acts of Parliament, which, though they establish communion in *both* kinds, yet make exceptions “in cases of *necessity*.”

To speak of the “Anathemas” of a Protestant Bishop, whose acknowledged moderation and forbearance accord with the unassuming and tolerant spirit of that Church, of which he is an ornament, is truly ridiculous ; but particularly so, when such is used by the Doctor of a Church, which, with unmitigated severity, thunders forth its execrations against, and consigns to perdition, those, who deny its infallibility.

When Doctor Milner tells us, that Luther in his correspondence with Carlostad, reproached him with “having placed Christianity in things of *no account*,” such as communicating under *both* kinds ; or, when he objects to us, that by a decree of the Calvinistic Synod of Poitiers, “the use of the wine was to be *dispensed* with :” he must be aware, that we neither profess the creed of Luther or Calvin. Had those Reformers, actuated as they were by a feeling of opposition to the Church of Rome, and infected as they must have been by its errors, either discontinued *suo marte* the receiving of *both* kinds, or admitted but of *one* ; it can only be said, that such is not the doctrine of our Church at

the present day : nor does it, in the remotest degree, countenance any departure from the original institution. It is, however, but a justice due to the Reformed Churches, to state; that they, but more particularly the Lutheran, to which Doctor Milner alludes, and which held the doctrine, that is so nearly allied to Transubstantiation, have *restored* the cup to the laity.

Lastly. Doctor Milner should know, that when the doctrines of the Church of England are concerned, Acts of Parliament are simply declaratory, and require nothing more than a conformity to them. With respect to the Act of Edward the Sixth, of which he speaks, and in which an exception is made, when *necessity* requires; he cannot but know, that it is inoperative—a mere dead letter, although unrepealed. That Statute says, that “ it being *more agreeable* to Christ’s first institution, and the practice of the Church for 500 years after Christ, that the Sacrament should have been given in *both* kinds of bread and wine, rather than in one kind only: therefore, it was enacted, that it should be commonly given in both kinds, *except necessity did otherwise require it.*” From this last clause he argues, that the Church of England did not at first conceive the wine to be an *essential* part of the Sacrament; “ for,” says he, “ if it did, no necessity could ever

plead in bar of the Sacrament, and men might as well pretend to celebrate the Eucharist **without* bread as *without* wine." Now in the *first* place, had Doctor Milner, who refers expressly to Burnet's History of the Reformation as bearing him out in this argument, only carried his eye to the bottom of the page, he would see that the Act in question was one of great consequence, since it reformed *two* abuses which had crept into the Church:—† "the one was *denying the cup* to the laity; and the other, the priests' communicating *alone*." And in the *next* place, had he only called to recollection, that Queen Mary, on her accession, *repealed*

* Doctor Milner says, "that he has heard of *British made wine* being frequently used by Church Ministers for *real wine*, and of the Missionaries to Otaheite using the *bread fruit* for *real bread*."—LETTER xxxix. p. 69. There is no doubt, but that *such* bread and wine should be substituted in the absence of *real* bread and wine. Those aliments nourish and sustain the body, when the others cannot be procured; why, therefore, may they not be as efficaciously used, as those others, to convey the spiritual nourishment, which is imparted by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? Whether Christ broke leavened, or unleavened bread is not clearly ascertained; as little known is the *particular sort* of wine, which He blessed. These are mere contingencies, and as well as the manner of receiving, are not essential to the Eucharist. But the participation of *both* bread and wine, is indispensable; because without them, we cannot do what Christ did and commanded to be done.

† HIST. OF THE REFORM., vol. II. part 2. pp. 41, 42.

this very Act, he would have concluded, that *she* did not consider it a sanction to the practice of communion in one kind ; to uphold which her clergy strenuously laboured at the time. But, besides, concurrent with this statute of Edward the Sixth, was the unanimous vote of the Convocation held in the first year of this young King's reign, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be received in *both* kinds by the laity as well as the Clergy. So that, although it may be sound Popish doctrine to consider the cup an *unessential* part of the sacrament, it certainly was abhorrent from the feelings, both of the framers of the Statute and of the Articles of our Church. And with respect to the exception, which the act makes in cases of *necessity*, such as sickness, or age, it may be said to be done away in 1562, the fourth of Elizabeth, by our thirtieth Article, inasmuch as it is *entirely silent* about half-communion in *any* case whatever.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, IMPIOUS.

HAD the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, although abounding with contradictions and absurdities, terminated where it began, in the mind; the Church of Christ would not have to lament those sins and abominations, which have been so fatal to its purity and innocence. But, as error in faith leads to error in practice, so the belief, that the bread and wine are by consecration converted into the real Body and Blood of Christ, produced as its natural result,—idolatry and sacrilege: the former, by the adoration of the elements; and the latter, by the denial of the cup to the laity. These practices, sinful as they are, are obstinately defended in “THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY.”

But, besides the idolatry and sacrilege, to which Transubstantiation gave birth, may be added, the gross impiety which arose out of it, in the sacrifice of the Mass; by which the sufficiency of our Saviour's Sacrifice *once* offered is roundly denied. For according to it, the Church of Rome considers the Lord's

Supper, both as a memorial of Christ's death, and as a *sacrifice* actually offered up to God ; and that it is not only commemorative, but *propitiatory*, both for the living and the dead ! The Eucharist is, no doubt, a sacrifice in a *figurative* sense, as when we call it a sacrifice of praise ; but no authority exists for calling it a sacrifice in the sense in which Christ is said to be one. It is also appropriately called a * “ feast upon a sacrifice,” at which we profess our belief in the death of Christ, and renew our baptismal covenant with him. Because, if after having made our humble † sacrifice of prayer and praise, “ we partake of the material feast ;” we may, also, be understood “ to partake of the spiritual benefits of the sacrifice.” So that, although we neither admit a substantial change, nor the reality of the victim, our feast is not, as Doctor Milner represents it ; “ an imaginary banquet on an ideal viand.” In conformity with this exposition, the Table of the Lord is an altar, on which is offered the *type* of the

* See BURNET, Article xxxi. p. 351, and the BISHOP OF WINCHESTER's Elem. of Theol., vol ii. p. 511. Bishops Warburton and Cleaver too call the participation of the Lord's Supper, “ a feast upon a sacrifice.” However, Cudworth seems to have been the first who distinctly treated of this subject, although the idea of it may be traced in the fathers.

† See Psalm li. 17, and cxli. 2. Also, THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

great Sacrifice of Christ Himself; while they who serve at it, discharging the priestly offices of consecration and absolution, are properly called priests. Where, then, is the inconsistency, with which the Church of England is chargeable respecting this point? “For,”* says he, “she has priests, but no sacrifice; altars, but no victim; and an essential consecration of the sacramental elements without any the least effect upon them.” No certainly: she has no supposititious carnal sacrifices, nor victims, like those of the Church of Rome; because she is too scriptural to maintain what is in its nature contradictory and impossible.

The Church of Rome esteems the † sacrifice of the Mass, as I have observed, to be *expiatory*, an *atonement* for sin, and a *means* of reconciling to God those for whom it is offered; whether on earth, or in *purgatory*. But the Scriptures do not warrant our calling it a *sacrifice*; nor do the records of the primitive Church furnish us with any document for considering it one. In fact, if the fathers thought

* LETTER xl. p. 77.

† In King Edward's First Book, 1549, this office is styled the Supper of the Lord, (1 Cor. xi. 20.) and the Holy Communion, (1 Cor. x. 16.) *commonly called the Mass*. At the Review of this Book in 1552, these latter words were expunged; although it is plain, that when they were first inserted, the term *Mass* was understood in its primitive acceptation.

it such, they would have called it so ; and when the heathens objected to them, that they possessed a religion *without* a sacrifice, they never called the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the *Sacrifice* of the Eucharist.

Usher, in his Religion of the ancient Irish, remarks * “ that the public liturgy or service of the Church was of old named *MASS*,” even so early as the sixth century among that people ; and that it was in those days applied to the *administration* of the Lord's Supper. He refers to Adamnanus, a writer of the seventh century, who both called the evening prayer the † *Vesper Mass* of the Lord's day, and took “ the sacred ministry of the Eucharist, and the solemnities of the Mass for the *same* thing.” The learned Primate likewise quotes Gildas, as saying, ‡ “ that the Britons were contrary to the whole world, and enemies to the Roman customs, not only in the *Mass*, but in the Tonsure.”

§ Bingham assigns three different significations to the word *Missa*, to shew that it was anciently a general name for every part of the

* Discourse, c. iv. p. 34. Ed. 1815.

† *Vespertinalis Missa*.—*IBID.*

‡ “ Britones toti mundo contrarii, moribus Romanis inimici non solum in *Missá*, sed etiam in tonsurá.”—*IBID.* Appendix, p. 142.

§ *ECCL. ANTIQ.* vol. i. book xii. p. 556. See also *SHEPHERD'S ELUCID.* vol. ii. p. 149.

divine service. It sometimes signified the *Lessons*; sometimes, the *Collects* or *Prayers*; and sometimes, the *dismissal* of the people; in which *third* sense, he says, “is the original notation of the word.” It has been attempted by Baronius and other Popish writers to derive *Missa* from the Hebrew; but Bingham overthrows this conceit, by observing that no Greek writer before the tenth century, retained it in their language, as they do the words *hosanna*, *sabbaoth*, &c. and therefore, that it could not have been of Hebrew derivation. If we look to more ancient authority, we shall find Ambrose to be the earliest writer, who makes mention of the word *Mass*, in the emphatical sense, when he says, * *Missam facere cepi*. The *Missa Catechumenorum*, and the *Missa Fidelium*, also denote a variation in the sense different from that, in which it is now understood in the Popish Church.

I therefore contend, that the doctrine, which relates to the sacrifice of the Mass, and to which Doctor Milner attaches so much importance as to make it the subject of a separate Letter, is of modern growth, and was unknown to the early Christians; and that it is unscriptural, as appears even from his own obscure references to the O. T., no less than from this circum-

* Epist. xx. ad Marcellin. p. 853. Ed. Bened.

stance, that the * Council of Trent made *no appeal* to Scripture for the purpose of establishing this doctrine; but merely declared it to be *according to* Apostolic Tradition—*juxta Apostolorum Traditionem*. Suffice it, therefore, to say with our xxxist Article, that “*the Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were* BLASPHEMOUS FABLES, AND DANGEROUS DECEITS.”

* The decree of the twenty-second Session is entitled, *Doctrina de sacrificio Missæ*, in which the Council urges the daily sacrifice of the Mass as an *unbloody* one, and as *propitiatory* for the sins of the living, as well as of the dead in purgatory! To this decree our THIRTY-FIRST Article was wisely opposed.

CHAPTER IX.

ABSOLUTION FROM SIN.

As I have already so fully treated of the Popish doctrines of Absolution from sin, Indulgences, Purgatory, Extreme Unction, the Invocation of Saints, and worship of Images, or, as Doctor Milner tenderly expresses it, Religious Memorials, in my ANSWER to Ward; and as the sense of the Established Church on these points is so well and so generally known; I shall merely confine myself to a Refutation of the charges, direct or implied, against our clergy, or our formularies, with which he has interspersed the Letters devoted to the above subjects. And in the very outset, I must disclaim all concern with the ribaldrous trash and extravagances of Martin Luther, on which Doctor Milner dwells with such apparent pleasure. He is not, what the Doctor wishes to make him, the Representative of the Church of England; nor are they his doctrines, which it sanctions.

* He first arraigns Bishop Porteus for being

“ chiefly bent on disproving the necessity of sacramental confession, and in depriving the sacerdotal Absolution of all efficacy whatsoever;” and for saying, “ that Christ did not give his Apostles any real power to remit sins, but only a power of declaring who were truly penitent, and of inflicting miraculous punishments on sinners; as likewise of preaching the word of God.” But, let a full and fair hearing be given the Bishop, and his arguments will be found to be incontrovertible. It is true, *he strenuously denies that our Saviour’s words, *whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, &c.* imparted a *discretionary* power of pardoning, or refusing to pardon, persons without distinction, whether right or wrong; and maintained, that though they possessed great powers by virtue of those words, namely, “ the power of *discerning* by the spirit,” and of declaring, “ who *were* penitent and pardoned, and who *were not* ;” and *that* likewise “ of *inflicting miraculous punishments* on wicked persons, which is *binding* their sins, and of removing such punishments, which is *loosing* their sins:”—powers, to which the Church of Rome can no more lay claim than ourselves; yet, with all this, he contends,

* CONFUTATION of the Errors of the Church of Rome, pp. 44, 45.

“ that the Apostles could not use the keys of the kingdom of Heaven further than it pleased the Searcher of Hearts to permit them.”

In such strong and emphatic language does the learned Prelate expound the commission of the keys, ascribing to it, as our Church properly does, neither more nor less authority than it really imparts; while Doctor Milner classes him among those who consider that commission as nugatory and void. But, however unfairly he has represented him, by the suppression of part of his statement, he has performed a still more unmerciful operation on the author, whom he has produced against, what he calls, * “ the Bishop’s vague and arbitrary gloss, on the decisive passage, John, xx. 22, 23.” His motive for not arguing the case himself is not a little remarkable; it is because the renowned Protestant Champion, Chillingworth, renders any effort of *his own* unnecessary; he having so successfully advocated the Roman Catholic doctrine. Yes! Chillingworth, mutilated and cut down, expresses the language of Popery, as Porteus is made to use that of Dissent. But it is in that way, and in that way only, that he can be made to appear favourable to a communion, into which he was betrayed, no less by

* LETTER xli. p. 84.

jesuitical artifice than juvenile indiscretion ; and from which he disengaged himself, when a matured judgment and more enlarged experience enabled him to see his error.

In order to give an adequate idea of Doctor Milner's expertness in the art of garbling, it is necessary to exemplify his skilful reduction of more than a FOLIO page of matter to something about the size of HALF an *octavo* page, in the following way. I should premise, that the sentences within the brackets are those of his selection ; while the others are those which he has suppressed. The former should be read first, and then the entire statement, as it stands. But, for the purpose of more clearly comprehending Chillingworth, we must take him a little higher up than the place, at which Doctor Milner begins ; for instance, where he refers to * Archbishop Usher, as conveying his own ideas on the subject. † “ Be it known to our adversaries of Rome, that the thing we *reject*, is that new pick-lock of confession, obtruded upon men's consciences as a matter NECESSARY to salvation, by the Canons of the Conventicle of Trent.” Chillingworth having thus identified the Primate's sentiments with his own, respect-

* ABB. USHER'S Answer to the Jesuit ; Chap. of Confession.

† CHILLINGWORTH'S Religion of Protestants, Serm. vii. p. 63.

ing the *new pick-lock*, as he calls it, proceeds to ask :—“ [Can any man be so unreasonable as to imagine, that when our Saviour] after his resurrection, having received, as himself saith, all power in heaven and earth, having led captivity captive, came then to bestow gifts upon men : when he, I say, [in so solemn a manner, having first breathed upon his disciples, thereby conveying and insinuating the Holy Ghost into their hearts, renewed unto them, or rather confirmed that glorious commission,] which before he had given to Peter, sustaining, as it were, the person of the whole Church, [whereby he delegated to them an authority of binding and loosing sins upon earth,] with a promise that the proceedings in the Court of Heaven should be directed and regulated by theirs on earth ; [can any man, I say, think so unworthily of our Saviour as to esteem these words of His for no better than compliment,] for nothing but *court holy water* ?”

Chillingworth afterwards proceeds to say—
 “ Yet so *impudent* have our adversaries of Rome been in their dealings with us, that they have dared to lay to our charge, as if we had so mean a conceit of our Saviour's gift of the keys, taking advantage, indeed, from the unwary expressions of some particular divines, who, out of too forward a zeal against the Church of Rome, have bended the staff too

much the contrary way ; and, instead of taking away that intolerable burden of a sacramental, *necessary*, universal confession, have seemed to void and frustrate all use and exercise of the keys."

The reader, on casting his eye over this long extract, will at once perceive, that so far from Chillingworth contravening what Bishop Porteus advances on the subject, as Doctor Milner says, or from expressing himself differently from the Church of England ; that his arguments have the same tendency as those used by both. Let him observe ; Chillingworth complains, that the Church of England is confounded with those, who, out of violent opposition to the Church of Rome, " have *bended* the staff *too much the contrary way*, and seemed to void and *frustrate* all use of the keys," by the entire rejection of Absolution ; instead of rendering it available to the purposes for which it was designed : while the * Bishop recommends the acknowledgment of our errors, and a disclosure of the state of our souls to the ministers of God's word, for " that their opinion, their advice, and prayers, may be extremely useful, sometimes necessary." Chillingworth condemns " the intolerable burden of a sacramental, *necessary*, universal confession ;" Porteus does the

* CONFUT. p. 46.

same, when he says, that Scripture no where makes Absolution "*necessary*," and that the chief text, which the Church of Rome pleads for this purpose, viz. *CONFESS YOUR FAULTS ONE TO ANOTHER, "no more obliges the people to confess their sins to the priest, than the priest to the people." And, lastly, Chillingworth upholds the authority, which Christ deputed to his ministers to release from sins, *upon an unfeigned repentance and contrition*; the Bishop says no more, when he remarks, "that it is not the priest's knowledge of a person's sins which can qualify him to grant Absolution, but knowing that he hath repented of them." To say, therefore, that those two great divines entertained discordant opinions on the subject, is not to state the fact; as there is, on this point, the most perfect harmony between them.

Thus is Chillingworth represented and misrepresented. In the former case, he argues *against* sacramental confession; that is, against confession considered as an *essential* part of a Sacrament instituted by Christ, and limits the exercise of the minister's authority to the *unfeigned contrition* of the penitent, and thus coincides with Bishop Portens; in the latter case, Doctor Milner makes him argue *for* the *necessity* of sacramental confession, and attribute

to sacerdotal Absolution, *all possible* efficacy; and consequently, makes him disprove every argument advanced by the Bishop of an opposite bearing. In fact, so mutilated and distorted is Chillingworth, by suppression and curtailment, that were Doctor Milner to treat Bishops Magee and Tomline in a similar way, he might exhibit the one as a staunch Unitarian, and the other as a rank Calvinist.

But although I rescue Chillingworth's authority from the degradation to which Doctor Milner has so shamefully reduced it; yet I must in candour declare, notwithstanding the high estimation in which he is so generally and so deservedly held, that I do not regard him "our *most renowned* champion." He was first a Protestant; afterwards, at the age of nineteen, conformed to Popery; and, lastly, became an *Antipapist*. As, therefore, his Protestantism was Protestantism in the abstract, he may be said to have been, in his latter days, what has been properly termed a *generalizing* Protestant, rather than a Protestant of the Established Church; or even than what Doctor Milner so insidiously calls him.

It will not, I trust, be objected to me, that I have dwelt too long upon so plain a case, when it is considered, what extraordinary pains Doctor Milner has been at to misstate Chillingworth's sentiments, and that without an en-

larged view of the subject, such deliberate perversion and misrepresentation as those of which he has been guilty, could not have been sufficiently exposed.

Supported, as he conceives himself to be, by the weight of Chillingworth's name, Doctor Milner next appeals to Luther's * Catechism, and Cranmer's Order of the Holy Communion, for determining the point concerning sacerdotal Absolution, in his favour. With respect to Luther, I willingly concede to him all the benefit which can be derived, either from his primary Confession of Faith, or from his Apology for that Confession. Both those documents would have no weight, were he, even as Doctor Milner calls him, the *Patriarch* of the Church of England; as they were drawn up immediately after he had shaken off the papal yoke, and before he had entirely divested himself of his early prejudices. In what relates to Cranmer, I join issue at once with him on the subject.

He sets out with attempting to prove, that the Church of England, in Edward the Sixth's reign, held, that particular Absolution was *necessary* in Confession, and that, even in the *present* day, its ministers maintain a doctrine in conformity with this tenet. For the former,

* *The forgiveness of the priest is the forgiveness of God.*—
This is rank Popery.

* he refers to the admonition in the Order of Communion, composed by Cranmer, and published by King Edward; and for the latter, to the Rubrick, immediately before the Absolution, and to the Absolution itself, in our Office for the Visitation of the Sick. It will be seen, that he fails in both attempts. The passage, which he cites from the Order of Communion, is to the following effect: † “ And if there be any of you whose conscience is troubled and grieved in any thing, lackyng comforte or counsayll, let him come to me, or to some other discrete and learned prieste, taught in the lawe of God, *and confesse and open his sinne and grieffe secretly* that of us he may receyve comforte and absolucion,” &c. But the very sentence which immediately precedes this extract, and which Doctor Milner has prudently withheld, shews on what terms our distinguished Reformer considered absolution to be efficacious. It is this: “ For, (*i. e.* unless restitution be made to your neighbour, &c. &c.) *neyther the absolucion of the prieste can any thing avayle them, nor the receyving of this Holy Sacrament doth any thing but increase*

* LETTER xli. pp. 85 and 86.

† This is part of the *only* exhortation which was inserted in King Edward the Sixth's First Book, WHITCHURCH's Edition, and is in a very different form from that in his Second Book, and in our present Book of Common Prayer.

their damnation." On these very words taken in connexion with those cited by Doctor Milner, I rest my defence of Cranmer's Order of Communion, that it does not *command* confession; nor pronounce absolution *necessary*; but leaves every person to act as he pleases. - In the preceding part too, of the same exhortation, the minister admonishes those, who are conscious of any crime, to *repent*, to *confess to Almighty God*, &c. In short, although it be transposed and very much altered in our present Communion Office, it is in substance the same, and consequently cannot be perverted to uphold a Popish doctrine.

The confessions which our Church enjoins are of a general nature, in which the priest unites with the congregation; and although it recommends special confession, under certain limitations, as in times of sickness, and when exhorting to attend the Sacrament; yet it is discretionary with the person himself, whether he confess or not. In our Book of Common Prayer, what corresponds with that cited by Doctor Milner, runs thus; "if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet or learned minister of God's word, and open his grief." Here is *no* command that private confession of sins should be made; as

the exhortation refers only to cases where a person cannot *quiet his own conscience*, and offers relief to such only as are disposed to seek it.

How different this from that whole and absolute confession, extending even to mortal sins, which the Church of Rome requires to be made once, at least, every year (**saltem semel in anno*), in private to the priest, and which constitutes so essential a part of its sacrament of penance. Not only *must* the members of that Church confess their sins at stated intervals, but confess them without reserve; thus submitting themselves to a species of religious slavery, to the endurance of which, the youthful mind is habitually trained, and to which, when it is advanced to maturity, it submits without a murmur. It is a duty, we know, imperative on us all to confess our sins to God; but to be *obliged* to make an annual confession to a priest, and to be told that the concealment of even a mortal sin from him is † a lie to the Holy Ghost, is the grossest insult that can be offered to the reason of man.

* CONCIL. TRIDEN. Sess. xiv. p. 136.

† Douay Catech. It is also asked in Butler's Catechism, p. 49:—

Q.—What do you think of those who conceal a mortal sin in confession?

A.—They commit a most grievous sin, *by telling a lie to the Holy Ghost*.

Doctor Milner next passes on to our Office for the Visitation of the sick, to which he refers, as being in conformity with the exhortation to the Sacrament on the subject of confession, and consequently as proving that the Churches of England and Rome *agree* in this particular. The expression on which he grounds his proof, is the very one on which all the Popish advocates exclusively rely, as implying a command; at least something more than a simple recommendation to the confession of sin. The following is the Rubric cited by him. “ Here the sick person shall *be moved* to make a special confession of his sins, if he *feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter*. After which confession the priest shall absolve him, *if he humbly and heartily desire it*, after this sort

*** I ABSOLVE THEE FROM ALL THY SINS, IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, &c. &c.”**

* This Absolution is often quoted, in order to shew the similarity of the Church of England to the Church of Rome ; but this is what has never yet been, indeed what never can be, made out. The Rev. Mr. Gandolphy has had recourse to a like expedient in the Popish prayer-book, which he edited some years ago. So ingeniously are the titles of the different offices drawn up, that the difference between it and our Book of Common Prayer is not at first sight discoverable. Thus, in the ordinary of the Mass, he speaks of *The Lord’s Supper together with the Holy Communion*, &c. Now what will the reader think of this gentleman, who, when charged in the *N. C. Orthodox Journal* of October, 1816, with abandoning the word *MASS*,

Let it be observed, that the sick man is here moved to confess; but in the Rubric immediately preceding, he is *earnestly* moved to be liberal to the poor. Now, if it cannot be said that he is *commanded* to dispose of his property as the minister directs; it will be still less insisted on, that he is *commanded* to confess, where the expression is simply “moved,” and, of course, less forcible than in the other case, where it is “*earnestly* moved.” And further, the words, “*if* he feels his conscience troubled,” shew, that it is * optional with the sick man, whether he confess or not; as the words, “*if* he humbly and heartily desire it,” shew, that he may, if he choose, dispense with the Absolution. Every thing is discretionary on the part of the sick person; indeed so much so, that if he give no intimation on these points, and ask for no relief, the minister is neither directed to enforce confession, nor of himself to absolve him. Here then is the simple course to pursue. The minister is to intreat the patient to confess his sins, if his conscience be disquieted. If this

declares “his sole intention in joining another expression (viz. the Lord’s Supper, &c.) was, to *reconcile* Protestants to the mystery?”—Surely such a motive would do credit to Loyola himself.

* The Church of England neither commands nor forbids private confession and absolution. “It recommends both, but does not *enjoin* either.”—SHEPHERD, vol. ii. p. 486.

appeal be unnoticed, he passes over the remaining directions in the Rubric. But should the patient indicate, that his conscience is troubled with some weighty matter; then the minister is to advise him to state the cause of his uneasiness, as the most certain way of affording himself relief. And, without some indication, how is his spiritual state to be known? Even then the minister does not pronounce the Absolution; nor, when desired to do so, would any well-informed Protestant clergyman consider himself as granting the positive form, such as, in the Church of Rome, affects to convey a *plenary* remission of sin, and not the *ministerial* and *declaratory* one. It is, as our Morning Service expresses it, “the power and commandment given by God to his ministers, to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins.” Lastly.—If any thing can decide the sense of our Church on this head, that it neither considers the absolution used in our Visitation Office, *essentially necessary* to salvation; nor, that the priest’s pronouncing it can of itself effect the remission of sins, it is this; that in the collect which immediately follows that form, the minister implores God “to open his eye of mercy on this his servant, who earnestly desireth *pardon* and *forgiveness*, &c. ;” which prayer would be grossly absurd, were the absolution employed *plenary*,

and, according to Doctor Milner, *judicial*: as it would be asking God to give the sick person what he had already obtained!

The * Council of Trent anathematizes those, who say, that it is a ministerial and not a *judicial* act. Accordingly, the judicial absolution is the one in *common* use in the Church of Rome, and is given to persons *in health*, as well as in sickness, after confession and the performance of the prescribed penance. The form, however, used by it for those at the point of death is also judicial, but more † concise than the ordinary one.

On this point, therefore, a wider difference exists between the two Churches, than Doctor Milner seems to have thought of, when he assimilated them. As in the one, Confession is *voluntary*; in the other, *compulsory*. In the one, it *rarely* happens; in the other, it is of *perpetual* recurrence. In the Church of England, *no abuse* can arise from it; while, in the Church of Rome, it is capable of being converted into an engine of *spiritual dominion*, from the power possessed by the priest to mea-

* “ Si quis dixerit Absolutionem sacramentalem sacerdotis, non esse *actum judiciale*m, sed nudum ministerium pronunciandi et declarandi remissa esse peccata confitenti; ANATHEMA SIT.”—SESS. xiv. Can. 9.

† “ Ego te absolvo ab omnibus censuris et *peccatis* in nomine Patris, Filii, et SS.”—RITUALE ROMAN. Ed. 1625. p. 58.

sure out to the offender the *degree* of his penance.

Should Doctor Milner be now asked, to what cases does the Church of Rome limit the exercise of this species of absolution; he must reply, that it is used on *all* occasions, whether emergent, or ordinary. The Council of Trent, he must add, has decreed, that the power of remitting sins is vested in the priest *himself*; and that he possesses, as it were, *ex officio*, a judicial power; and therefore, that it is fitly exercised in *every* possible case, which may occur. But can any thing be more presumptuous and absurd, or more repugnant to Scripture and reason, than to claim such a power? As if the Almighty's will were to depend on the decision of a fallible creature, and his justice to be dispensed at the discretion of man! It is certain, that after the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, that a power of this kind was vested in the Apostles, and that they besides had * “the *discerning of spirits*,” and could discover † the inmost thoughts of the heart. They could also judge with certainty, who were forgiven, and who not. But no such power can be claimed for their successors, who, unaided by inspiration, and liable to error, might by

* 1 Cor. xii. 10.

† Acts, v. 3. 9. and viii. 21. 23.

possibility remit, or retain sins, contrary to what it pleased God to do.

I have only one word to add on the * shorter form of absolution. It was unknown in the Church for the first *twelve* centuries; therefore, the compilers of our Liturgy prudently prefixed some words of prayer, or, as it is called, the †precatory form, and thus combined the two forms into one, as it stands in our Office for the visitation of the sick. The words, *te ab omnibus censuris absolvo*, exemplify the act of *judicial* power in the relaxation of ecclesiastical censures; but it is impious to say, that the priest can exercise a judicial power in the *remission* of sin, as it is, in effect, clothing him with an ‡attribute of the Deity.

* See note (†), p. 260.

† SHEPHERD specifies a variety of absolutions in the Romish Church, all running in the *precatory* form.—Vol. ii. p. 480.

There are three forms of absolution in our service, which are thus admirably illustrated in Bishop Mant's Book of Common Prayer: "1. When a person says, by virtue of a commission granted to me under the Prince's hand and seal, I release this prisoner. 2. The prince, who hath given me this commission, he pardons you. 3. Prince! Pardon and deliver you;—the Prince then standing by and confirming the word of his servant. All these are but several expressions of the *same* thing."

‡ In a book published by Keating and Co. entitled, *Missæ propriæ ordinis Francisci*, &c., the importance of those ple-

Following up the attack on our Visitation Office, Doctor Milner refers to the 113th Canon of the Church of England, which, he says, **“ encourages the secret confession of sins, and requires her ministers not to reveal the same.”* But where is the inconsistency in this? By the 109th Canon, the Churchwardens or Quest-men are required *“ faithfully to present all offenders to their Ordinaries ;”* but when they forbear to discharge this duty through negligence, the Parson, Vicar, or Curate is required, by the 113th Canon, to supply the defect. Now, as confession to a minister is *allowed*, though not *commanded*, by the exhortation to attendance at the Lord’s table, as *before* observed ; it would be absurd, indeed, were no difference to be placed between those, who accepted this invitation of their own accord, and whose sins were only known to themselves ; and those, whose *“ scandals”* were notorious. The provision in the 113th Canon, relating to Ministers, who present notorious offenders to the ecclesiastical

nary indulgences *in articulo mortis*, and of the absolution to which they lead, is fully set forth. The plenary indulgence granted to the members and retainers of the foregoing order at the point of death, is thus expressed *Et restituo te illi statui innocentia in quo eras, quando baptizatus fuisti ; in nomine Patris, &c. &c. !* In sober sadness, I ask Doctor Milner, is there nothing blasphemous in this arrogant assumption of divine power ?

* LETTER xli. p. 86.

courts, is to this intent:—" Provided always, that if any man confess his secret and hidden sins to the minister, for the unburdening of his conscience, and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind from him; we do not any way bind the said minister by this, our constitution, but do straightly charge and admonish him, that he do not at any time *reveal* and *make known* to any person whatsoever any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secrecy," &c. This Canon is, as I have already said, in exact accordance with the second exhortation in the communion service, and demands no other defence than that given in the wise provision just recited, which forbids what would constitute the basest treachery—that of revealing secrets, which are disclosed as a relief to a troubled conscience.

Thus it appears, that our Church is, in her every act, consistent; while no grounds whatever exist for instituting a parallel between it and the Church of Rome on the subject of Absolution.

CHAPTER X.

INDULGENCES.

BISHOP PORTEUS having, in his Confutation of the Errors of Popery, treated of Purgatory, before he entered on the subject of Indulgences, **Doctor Milner** speaks of his “reversing the proper order,” and affects to pity him, on account of “the confusion of his ideas, and his *very imperfect* knowledge,” concerning both subjects! This, no doubt, is extremely tender in the Doctor. But it so happens, that the Bishop has been most judicious in proceeding in the order he has done; because, by having proved the place of a temporary punishment to be a creature of the imagination, repugnant to Scripture and to every dictate of reason and common sense, he thereby weakened one of the strongest arguments in favour of Indulgences. For, as the Romish Doctors do not pretend to release the suffering spirit from a more rigid bondage than that of Purgatory, the proof of its non-existence would determine, that Indulgences were only applicable to this present life, and would consequently diminish, if not destroy, both their

power and profit. Such appears to me to have been the Bishop's motive, and a most sensible one it unquestionably was, for reversing, what Doctor Milner calls, the proper order. But I am not left to unsupported conjecture on the point, as Bishop Jewell, that good old father of our Church, establishes the justness of my observation, and puts to silence every cavil on the subject. In fact, it is more than probable that Bishop Porteus had his reasoning in view, when he adopted the course he pursued. Thus Jewell, after observing, that it is not quite clear by whom Indulgences were first granted, goes on to say, **“ that among the ancients there is no mention, or certainly very little, of purgatory. But as long as there was no care about purgatory, no man sought after Indulgences ; for the whole credit of Indulgences depends upon purgatory. Take away purgatory, and what need is there of Indulgences ? Indulgences began when men came to tremble at the torments of purgatory.”*

In the primitive ages of the Church, long and severe penances were imposed upon those, who had been guilty of public or private sins ; but were afterwards mitigated when the offenders appeared to deserve it by their contrition and repentance. This relaxation of ecclesiastical

* BISHOP JEWELL'S Defence of his Apology, p. 486.

discipline was called an INDULGENCE, and when wisely exercised was, no doubt, promotive of religion and piety. But the Popish Indulgence is of a different description. It supposes a treasure in the Church, consisting of the infinite merits of our blessed Redeemer, and of * “the *overplus* of the goodness of the Saints made transferable by the ministry of the Pope, for the purpose of remitting the sins of those, who, while on earth, perform certain prescribed acts; or whose friends will perform them *after* their death.” The dispensation of this treasure was arrogated by the Roman Pontiffs, in the eleventh century, who thus perverted into an instrument of their ambition and avarice, that power which the Church had at first discreetly exercised for the maintenance of its discipline. During the next four centuries, the clergy abused it by licentiousness and tyranny; and instead of allowing the voluntary and open confession, which formerly prepared the work of reconciliation to the Church, they became inquisitors, interrogating the offender, and compelling him to account for his thoughts, words, and actions. But, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, the misrule of the Church had arrived at the highest pitch of infamy and flagitiousness, as

* CONFUTATION of Popish Errors, p. 53.

the commission granted to * Tetzal most fully demonstrates. This audacious monk publicly proclaimed that the Indulgences, with the sale of which Leo X. exclusively entrusted him, imparted to the *purchaser* the remission of all sins, past, present, and *to come*; and even went so far in his impiety as to derogate from the all-sufficient merits of Christ, and to extend the remission of divine punishments inflicted on offenders, to a *future* state. It was at that period, as in his own appointed time, that God put a stop to all these enormities. It was at that period, that our *Patriarch* Luther, as Doctor Milner sneeringly calls him, single-handed opposed the ambition and despotism of the lordly Pontiffs, and who ultimately succeeded in humbling their grandeur, and in eclipsing their glory. And lastly, it is to that period, that the Roman Catholics of this Empire should in justice and gratitude ascribe their comparatively happy state to what those enjoy, who live in countries purely Popish. Of Luther it is not necessary for me to say much. A genius great and unparalleled; a memory vast

* In describing the efficacy of these Indulgences, Tetzal used to boast, "*that he had saved more souls from hell by their means than St. Peter had converted to Christianity by his preaching.*"—MOSH. ECCLES. HIST. vol. iv. p. 30—33.

and tenacious; an incredible patience in the endurance of labour; a mind not easily subdued, and extensive learning; seem to have marked him out as one of those great characters, whom Providence in its wisdom employs at distant intervals, to effect some great purpose or other. But, whatever his defects and weaknesses may have been, (although I consider him worth ten thousand of such persons as those, who revile his memory;) the glorious cause of the Reformation is in no manner affected thereby, but stands on the ground of its own intrinsic merits.

Since the era of the Reformation, reserved as the Romish Church has been about the sale of * Indulgences, instances are not wanting where perfect strangers have obtained them from the Holy See. A remarkable one is related by Bishop Porteus of a plenary Indulgence having been purchased at Rome, in the year 1745. But, because he does not tell, who granted it, Doctor Milner insinuates a doubt of its existence. But surely the Bishop's asseveration, that it not only existed, but that it was in his *actual possession* at the time he wrote, sufficiently authenticates the fact. It was drawn up, his Lordship says, not merely in favour of the person

* When the Council of Trent (Sess. xxv.) passed the decree about Indulgences, no reference whatever was made to Scripture to support it. The power of the Church, *divinely handed down to it, (divinitus sibi tradita,)* was its sole basis.

to whom it was given, but also * “ of his kindred to the *third degree*, and to *thirty persons more*, for whose name a proper blank is left in the instrument.” When it is considered what a door is here thrown open to sin, can Doctor Milner deny, that † Mrs. Hannah More, when she describes Roman Catholics as “ procuring indemnity for future gratifications, by temporary abstractions, and Indulgences purchased at the Court of Rome,” is not fully justified in saying so? Will he, after this, deny, that Indulgences have only a reference to canonical penance, and only absolve from the censures of the Church? But should he attempt to do so, let him account for a plenary ‡ Indulgence, which the present Pope granted to the faithful of both sexes, in a certain district in England, in the year 1808, who should utter a short form of prayer therein contained. The Indulgence I speak of was, after certain repetitions of that

* CONFUT. of Popery, p. 55. In an admirable little work published in Glasgow, and now reprinting in Cork, there is a concise yet circumstantial account of an Indulgence granted as a special mark of favour, to persons of the name of Rose, at Kilravack in Scotland. It contains a remission of *all* their sins, to *all the branches* of that family, from the time of granting it, to a period, of which there *still remain* sixty years unexpired!—See THE PROTESTANT, pp. 7 and 26.

† STRICTURES on Female Education, vol. ii. p. 248.

‡ See the LAITY'S Directory, for 1821, published by Keating, London.

prayer, extended to the living and the dead, and also to the hour of dissolution. Here also, let Doctor Milner honestly say, what means a plenary Indulgence *in articulo mortis* ; and how the remission of canonical penance is effected by it ; or, how canonical penance is applicable to the dead, so as to be removeable only by the intercession of friends.

But, to come lower down, let Doctor Milner explain the nature of the Indulgence, which the See of Rome granted to the late Doctor Moylan, titular Bishop of Cork, on the completion of his Cathedral Chapel in that city. And let him deny, if he can, that the solemn plenary *INDULGENCE in question only absolved from ecclesiastical censure.

In the document to which I allude, a great deal is said about penance, and but little of *repentance*. But the principal stress is laid on the Indulgence, which, through the act of the church, procures the forgiveness of sin. It is by the Indulgence, and the Indulgence alone, the man is saved. Let us now see what entitles the penitent to obtain the benefit of this act of Grace. "*A good Confession, assisting at least eight times at the instructions, and pious exercises of the holy mission; a visit to the Cathedral; FIVE*

* The BULL was dated May, 1809, but was not acted on by Doctor Moylan until November, 1813.

PATERS, FIVE AVES, AND A CREED," will fulfil the obligation!! If this be not indulgent, and an easy way of blotting out sin, it is difficult to say what is. The treatment of the devotee resembles that of a sick man, who first acknowledges his disease, and after his recovery, must attribute his cure to the nostrum he had taken. What can the observance of those things amount to, if not to superstition? Is it not making religion to consist chiefly in form, and holding out an encouragement to sin? For, when a person obtains his Indulgence, confesses, and is absolved, he heedlessly contracts new debts, knowing how easily he can afterwards discharge them. Nothing more is requisite to entitle him to return to confession, than to perform the new penance assigned him; his absolution the second time is the immediate consequence.

Here we are told by the first authority, "that the priest is ready to ease the sinner of *the burden of sin*." And again, "that he is authorized to absolve from *all sins and censures* reserved to the *Holy See and to us*," viz. to Doctor Moylan. So that when Doctor Milner so confidently asserts, that an Indulgence is a relaxation of canonical penance, and that when * "the pardon of sin is mentioned in any Indulgence, this means nothing more than the remission of the

* LETTER xlii. p. 96.

temporary punishments annexed to such sin ; I would remind him of the Absolution given by the priest, which is evidently, (*tàm à pænâ quam à culpâ,*) as well from the punishment as the guilt ; and I should then call on him to reconcile such Absolution with his theory. But this, I am satisfied, he could never do.

Although I have considered the Indulgence granted to the late Doctor Moylan, only in a religious light ; yet we should never forget, that transactions of this kind have always a reference, mediate or immediate, to our ecclesiastical establishment. Indeed, except on such a supposition, it would be impossible to account for the pomp and parade, which attended the opening of this new Cathedral, in opposition to the true and proper Cathedral of the established Church ; accompanied as it was, by all that solemnity, which the Church of Rome reserves for the most important occasions.

Towards the concluding part of his Letter on Indulgences, Doctor Milner, by way of re-crimination, urges, that we *too* have our Indulgences ; for * “ that Luther, in conjunction with Bucer and Melancthon, granted one to Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, to have two wives at the same time, and that he preached up adultery, robbery, and murder, in his public sermons.” I

* *Ibid.* p. 103.

have more than once had occasion to say, that, admitting Luther to have deserved all the opprobrium heaped on his character by Popish writers, still we should not be bound to defend him. If we pinned our faith on his sleeve; if we esteemed him infallible in faith or in practice, then he would be entitled to our advocacy. But as we think him to have been a fallible man, though not less infallible than the Pope, we are no way answerable for his mistakes. The man who was liberated from the darkness of the Bastile, after a forty years' confinement, did not all at once recover the distinctness of his vision: so it was with Luther; his mental eye was still bedimmed, even after he had torn off the Popish film which obscured it. If he granted the * Indulgence of which Doctor Milner speaks, and acted so unworthily of the great cause in which he was engaged; yet shall

* Will Doctor Milner believe, that Pope Clement VII. made the offer of an indulgence to King Henry VIII., through Gregory Cassalis, his ambassador at Rome, that he might have *two* wives? The letter states, "*superioribus diebus, Pontifex, secreto, veluti rem quam magni faceret, mihi proposuit conditionem hujusmodi, concedi posse vestræ Majestati ut duos uxores habeat.*"—LORD HERBERT'S History of the Life and Reign of Hen. VIII., p. 330, *British Museum Library*. The historian adds, "that no effect followed thereof, as the King forbade purchasing or publishing any bull from the court of Rome; and thus began to shake off the Romish yoke."—P. 331.

he not derive some palliation for his conduct, from the peculiar circumstances in which he was placed? Besides, we must remember, if he gave way and fell in the moment of temptation, that he was at the same time surrounded by malignant enemies; while he was fearful of risking the loss of a powerful friend, who would probably have increased their strength in the event of a refusal. But, what is this isolated instance, which only forms a single exception to the manner in which the Reformers proceeded, to the numberless Indulgences which have been granted by the Bishops of Rome? However, be it admitted, that his conduct was, in this respect, inexcusable; still, we cannot but draw a broad line of distinction between it and a power claimed, and systematically exercised, by the Head of a Church arrogating to himself the attribute of infallibility, and sacrificing every moral obligation to his individual ambition or avarice. As to what Doctor Milner says about Luther's preaching up adultery, it is to be utterly disregarded; for often as the imputation has been repeated, it never yet came forward substantiated by an iota of evidence.

I cannot conclude this chapter without expressing my commendation of Doctor Milner's delicacy in not retorting on us the advertisements he frequently sees in the newspapers, "about *buying* and *selling* benefices with the

cure of souls annexed to them in our Church.” He knows the cases are not most distantly analogous, and he, therefore, very discreetly indeed, forbears to compare them. For what proportion can one simoniacal act, even if it be committed and escape detection, bear to the myriads of sins, of which Indulgences, Confessions, and Absolutions are productive?

CHAPTER XI.

PURGATORY.

THE inveteracy of the Popish religion is in no instance more distinctly seen, than in that tenet which respects Purgatory, or a temporary state of punishment in another life. The same confident and authoritative tone with which it was officially declared an article of faith by the Council of Trent, characterizes the different writers who have since supported it; but not one in a more distinguished degree than Dr. Milner. With whatever arrogance or self-sufficiency Bellarmine or Bossuet, the Rhemish je-suits, or Thomas Ward, may have pronounced their dogmas; of this I am perfectly satisfied, that not an individual among them has assaulted his opponent with greater rudeness and intemperance than Doctor Milner has the late excellent and learned Bishop Porteus. As, however, that distinguished Prelate's character stands too high in public opinion to be affected by any thing, which he can say, I shall confine myself to what is more immediately the object of these pages.

The learned Bishop argues, * “ that there is no Scripture proof of the existence of Purgatory; otherwise, that Christ would not have concealed it from us, and that we read of heaven and hell perpetually in the Bible; but Purgatory *we never meet with.*” To this conclusive and most convincing argument, what does Doctor Milner oppose? Indeed, a parallel one respecting the sanctification of the Sabbath, or Saturday; but that we never meet with the Sunday as a day of obligation; although, if there were such an obligation, Christ would not have *concealed* it from us. This also is one of the many cases adduced by Doctor Milner, between which and the Bishop’s, we have no more than a glimmering of analogy. But, if Christ did not speak about keeping the first day of the week holy; yet, by his selection of that day for his resurrection from the dead, he furnishes a sufficient reason for making it a day of obligation; particularly, as on that day he completed that dispensation, which, in every part, superseded the Jewish one, that antecedently existed. This very distinction marked the Sunday as the new Sabbath, and the practice of the Apostles meeting and breaking bread on that day, above any other, no less than the sacredness with which it was kept by the primitive Christians, decidedly proves, that they

* CONFUT. p. 48.

considered such to be the intention of their blessed Master. Our Saviour's example, therefore, and the imitation of it by his Apostles, and the first Christians, speak volumes for the *sanctification* of the first day of the week, and for its appointment as a day of obligation. Now, as we have not so much as *an intimation* from our Saviour, *no precept* from the Apostles, and *no mention* respecting Purgatory in the Creeds of the early Christians; and as, moreover, Doctor Milner does not seem to lay much stress on his parallel, and as I myself cannot see the bearing points in either case, which could be made to meet, I the more readily accompany him to what he calls his Scripture proofs from the Old and New Testament, of the existence of this middle state.

Let us first see what the Council of Trent says in its decree, relating to Purgatory.—
 * “ Since the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, *out of the sacred writings*, has taught that there is a Purgatory, this holy Council commands the Bishops to do their diligent endeavours, that the *sound* doctrine of Purgatory, as handed down *by the holy Fathers and the sacred Councils*, be believed,

* “ Cum Catholica Ecclesia, spiritu sancto edocta ex sacris literis docuerit, Purgatorium esse præcipit sancta Synodus Episcopis, et *sanam* de Purgatorio doctrinam *a sanctis Patribus et sacris conciliis traditam*, a Christi fidelibus credi diligenter studeant.”—SESS. XXV.

retained, taught, and every where preached, by the faithful in Christ." It is remarkable, that the decree introduces, but does not end with, an appeal to the Scriptures. It is further remarkable, that there is no allusion whatever to Scripture, in the decree about the Sacrifice of the Mass, in which the mention of Purgatory also occurs. This decree says of the Host, * " that it is duly offered, according to the tradition of the Apostles, not only for the sins, &c. of the *living*, but also for those who are deceased in Christ, and *are not yet fully purged of their sins*." So total a † silence respecting Scripture, in my mind, completes the proof, that the Trent Fathers were conscious, that it afforded them no support on the subject of Purgatory. But

* " Quare non solum pro fidelium vivorum peccatis, pœnis, &c. sed *pro defunctis* in Christo, *nondum ad plenum purgatis*, rite juxta Apostolorum Traditionem."—SESS. xxii.

† The Bishop of Winchester having remarked, in his *Elements of Theology*, vol. i. p. 279, " that the Epistles are not to be considered as regular treatises upon the Christian religion : " the expression is laid hold of by Doctor Milner, as if it afforded a countenance to tradition. But had he completed the sentence by adding, " though *its most essential* doctrines are occasionally introduced and explained," and told his reader, that the Bishop's general arguments on the Canon of the New Testament, go to prove the perfectness of the Christian scheme, as detailed in it; the idea that his Lordship admitted the necessity of *collateral* aid to supply a supposed deficiency, would have been removed.—But fairness of this kind is not to be expected from Doctor Milner.

to supply this deficiency, Doctor Milner attempts more than they themselves have done: first, by a reference to the second book of Maccabees, which he considers an *integral* part of the Old Testament; and secondly, to certain passages in the New Testament. Thus in the very outset, we differ about the value of the authority quoted.

The Church of Rome has declared the two first books of the Maccabees *canonical*. In conformity with this declaration, the Translators of the Douay Bible say, * “ that the Canon of the Christian Catholique Church is of *sovereigne* auctoritie, though the Jewes’ Canon have them not.” On the other hand, we have seen that the Church of England esteems those books canonical, and those only, of which our Saviour made express mention after his Resurrection. But, as this point has been † already discussed, I shall now inquire whether the passage in question gives any support to the doctrine of Purgatory.

It is stated, ‡ “ that Judas Maccabeus sent a collection of money, which he made, to Jerusalem, for a sacrifice to be offered for sinne, well and religiously thinking of the resurrec-

* DOUAY Preface to the two first Books of Maccabees.

† See p. 2, et seq.

‡ II. Maccab. xii. 40. DOUAY TRANSL. Ed. 1610.

tion." If we now connect this passage with the mention made in a preceding one, * " that they found under the coates of the slayne, some of the † *donaries* of the idols, that were in Jamnia, from which the lawe forbiddeth the Jewes ;" we shall see the reason for which the sin-offering was made by the pious general. He entertained a proper sense of the danger to which he had been exposed by the sin of those men, and prayed to God, that it might not be imputed to the people ; offering at the same time a sacrifice for sin, according to the law : " because he perceived that there was great favour laid up for those that died godly." But the men, who were slain, died in a mortal sin ; viz. the sin of idolatry. Now, as according to the Popish idea, those who are guilty of a mortal sin, cannot go to Purgatory ; it follows, that those could not be relieved by the prayers of the living from a place to which their guilt debarred their admission. And besides, if we take the account of what Judas did, as it stands in the apocryphal book referred to ; its immediate relation is not to the dead, and by consequence, not to Purgatory. But supposing that the dead are alluded to, the allusion is to their *future*

* IBID.

† " *Things consecrated to the Idols.*"—OUR AUTHORIZED TRANSL.

resurrection, and not to their *present punishment*. From all which it is clear, that Doctor Milner's quotation from Maccabees is irrelevant to the subject of Purgatory. When to the reasons assigned for the rejection of this book, is added the circumstance of its not being once mentioned by any of the writers of the New Testament, or cited as an inspired book, by any ecclesiastical author of the three first centuries; we may safely conclude, that Purgatory is, as our twenty-second Article says, "A FOND THING, VAINLY INVENTED, AND GROUNDED UPON NO WARRANTY OF SCRIPTURE, BUT RATHER REPUGNANT TO THE WORD OF GOD."

Doctor Milner's references to the New Testament are the trite ones made use of by every supporter of this foolish and unscriptural conceit. I shall not, therefore, follow him in the stupid track, which he has marked out, but content myself with noticing some one or two points as I pass along.

Bishop Porteus's gloss on the text, * "*If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, YET SO AS BY FIRE,*" is almost "too feeble and insignificant" to merit even being mentioned by Doctor Milner. Suffice it, however, to say, that that Prelate has

* 1. Cor. iii. 15.

followed Secker and the other learned Commentators, who have discovered no sanction for Purgatory in this passage of St. Paul; but an allusion, either to the fiery trial of persecution, or rather, to the final judgment of God, when both danger and difficulty would attend an escape. But to let this pass, in order that we may arrive at Doctor Milner's proof positive from Scripture, of the existence of Purgatory, in Christ's denunciation concerning blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; namely, that this sin * "*shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.*" The † Doctor says, that these words "clearly imply, that *some sins* are forgiven in the world to come."—A proof by implication is a *strong* one certainly, for establishing an Article of Faith; yet such is the nature of that used by him in the present instance. But to shew how erroneously he infers Purgatory from those words, I shall first briefly observe with Bishop Porteus, his *feeble* antagonist, that they denounce punishment, both here and hereafter, for the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and that it would *never* be forgiven: or next, with ‡ Mr. Wake, that some sins *shall* assuredly be forgiven in the world to come, even all those that *are forgiven*

* Matt. xii. 32.

† LETTER xliii. p. 107.

‡ PRESERVATIVE against Popery, vol. ii. Tit. vii. p. 119.

in this, and for which, therefore, God will not call us to an account at the last day. In no sense, therefore, can “this comfortable doctrine,” as Doctor Milner calls it, be derived from the text spoken of.

The most palpable absurdities follow from the supposition, that such a place as Purgatory exists. For, according to the Popish argument, those only shall be forgiven, who die in *venial* sin. But, first, what has Purgatory to do with remission of sin, being a place, not where sins are remitted, but where they are punished with extreme rigour, *after* they are remitted; and what is still more extraordinary, punished because they *are* remitted? And secondly, if the guilt were not remitted, the sinner would be excluded Purgatory. To say, therefore, that God forgives the guilt of sin, and yet that the obligation to punishment remains, is in effect to say, that God forgives the guilt, and does not forgive it, at the same time—which is highly absurd! So that, in every view of the case, it is worse than ridiculous to conclude, that there is a place, where every the least sin is severely punished, and where the sufferings of the sinner can be mitigated by the prayers of the living; by the intercession of saints; but particularly by the Sacrifice of the Mass; independently of the death and merits of Christ. Indeed, so truly nonsensical is the idea respecting Purga-

tory, that it must have long since been abandoned, did not interested motives stand in the way.

Having demonstrated how completely Doctor Milner has failed in his Scripture proofs for establishing the doctrine of Purgatory, I feel but little disposed to trespass on my reader's patience by enlarging on the sense of the early Fathers, whose authority, on this subject, he grossly misapplies; and still less to excuse *Calvin, †Priestley, and others, for holding what he terms a general *Protestant* Purgatory. The authority of the Fathers I deem respectable,

* Doctor Milner repeats the charge of blasphemy against Calvin, which Ward advanced upwards of a century ago. Although it was foreign to the object of my Answer to his Errata to vindicate any other tenets, than those of the Church of England; yet a regard to truth induced me to give a correct statement of Calvin's view respecting Christ's descent into hell, for the purpose of shewing the gross injustice which had been done him. See ANSWER to Ward, p. 76.

† The Bishop of Raphoe, where he argues against Doctor Priestley's idea of substituting a Purgatory in place of an eternal punishment, says, "if the idea of punishment for that which was the result of inevitable necessity, be repugnant to the essential nature of Justice, it must be equally so, whether that punishment be of *long or short duration*." DISCOURSES ON Atonement, &c. vol. ii. p. 397. I may add that it is equally repugnant to right reason to suppose, that a God of infinite mercy and goodness should punish, merely for the sake of punishing, those, who are justified in his sight, through the blood of his only SON, JESUS CHRIST.

but not decisive; and it is with this feeling I contend with Doctor Milner about its possession. Origen, Cyprian, and Tertullian, speak, it is true, of a Purgatory. The first conceived that there were *no* pains at all, but those of Purgatory after this life. This notion was condemned by the fifth General Council as heretical; yet without mentioning any other Purgatory in contradistinction to it. The second applied it to the penance inflicted on those who had lapsed in times of persecution. And the third, to Christ's millenary kingdom. But how different is this from the Popish Purgatory, as defined by the Council of Trent? When to this is added a perfect silence respecting this doctrine, in the Creeds, catechetical Discourses, and Decrees of their times, I must set it down as one of the novelties of the Church of Rome, and not as an article of Faith in the primitive Catholic Church.

The unfairness with which Doctor Milner treats Archbishop Usher, compels me to rescue his great name from the obloquy in which he has involved it. Of eight Divines of the Church of England, whom he expressly mentions as believing, that "the dead ought to be prayed for," I can only speak decidedly of one, namely, the Archbishop. But should I make it appear, that that illustrious individual among them, to whose works alone I have at present

access, and who is in himself a host, condemns this very practice of *praying for the dead* as a “monstrous foolery;” I shall, at least, have cast a suspicion on Doctor Milner’s candour, as to the use he makes of the remaining seven.

* Archbishop Usher begins with observing; that, in the book ascribed to St. Patrick, *de tribus habitaculis*, there is no mention of any other place after this life, but of these two,—*Heaven* and *Hell*; and that he leaves it to the judgment of any indifferent man, whether it accords with “what the Romans teach concerning Purgatory at this day. There are,” he adds, “*three habitations under the power of Almighty God*. The highest is called the kingdom of Heaven, the lowermost is termed Hell, the *middle* is named the *present world*. Of which the extremes are altogether contrary to each other; but the middle has some similitude with the extremes. For in this world, there is a mixture of the bad and of the good together. Whereas in the kingdom of God, there are none bad, but all good; but in hell there are none good, but all bad. And both these places are supplied out of the middle.” From this language may be collected what the sentiments of the Irish Clergy respecting Purgatory were in the beginning of the fifth century; while the manner, in

* DISCOURSE on the Religion of the ancient Irish, p. 24.

which the Archbishop introduced it, shews what he himself thought on the subject. But the question, whether the sins of the dead could be redeemed by the prayers of their friends in life, he treats with derision.

The Archbishop then proceeds to say, * “ that in those elder days it was an usual thing to make *prayers* and oblations for the rest of those souls which were not *doubted* to have been in glory ; and, consequently, that neither the commemoration, nor *the praying for the dead*, nor the *requiem* masses of that age, have *any* necessary relation to the belief in purgatory.” He then concludes, from Jerome, that “ while we are in this present world, we may be able to help one another, either by our prayers or our counsels ; but when we shall come before the judgment-seat of Christ, neither Job, nor Daniel, *can intreat* for any one ; but each must bear *his own* burdens.” And, lastly, † “ that in hell no need can be supplied, *no prayer* be heard.” After this impartial statement of Archbishop Usher’s sentiments on this point, I shall leave it to the discretion of the reader to pronounce that sentence on Doctor Milner, which his misrepresentation of an eminent author loudly calls for.

As it would be painful to me to mark, in appropriate language, my sense of the outrage

* *IBID*, p. 29.

† *IBID*, p. 30.

committed by Doctor Milner on one of the esteemed Prelates of our Church of the present day ; I shall simply state the particulars of it. His assaults on Bishops Tomline and Burgess may possibly find some extenuation in their published sentiments ; but the violence done to the present *Bishop of Lincoln is without excuse. His Lordship is represented, by Dr. Milner, to have “ *published* a sermon,” when Bishop of Exeter, in which “ HE PRAYS FOR THE SOUL *of our poor Princess Charlotte, as far as this is lawful and PROFITABLE.*” The rank Popery of this language excited my suspicions and inquiries ; and the result has been the discovery, that although the then Bishop of Exeter preached in his Cathedral on the great national loss sustained by the death of that lamented Princess ; yet, that he not only DID NOT PUBLISH, but *never* so much as expressed a sentiment, which could be tortured into any thing of the kind !!! As I speak from authority, I invite Doctor Milner to investigate the truth of what I say. For the present, I add another leaf to his laurels.

We are next confronted with the authority of the celebrated Doctor Johnson, for the necessity of offering up prayers for the dead ; as if the morbid melancholy inherent in the constitution of that great man, and the † terrific

* The Hon. and Right Rev. Dr. Pelham.

† HAWKINS'S Life of Johnson, p. 316.

dreams with which he was haunted, and which scarcely afforded him a hope that his deceased wife was in a state of happiness, did not sufficiently account for the agitation of his mind, and for the gloomy notions entertained by him about a future life. Yet, with all his peculiarity of thought on this head, * *his* middle state was not one, on which he looked with horror ; but only as not being the most blissful. But such wayward conceptions, although urged by Doctor Milner as a proof, that we have a Purgatory of our own, fall equally under the censure of our Church with the Popish doctrine, as *fond things, vainly imagined*, and not only not supported by, but directly opposed to, the Word of God.

One concluding observation will suffice, either on Doctor Milner's want of taste, or on his proneness to detraction ; when he calls our Burial Service, "*a cold and disconsolate ceremony.*" Here I would ask, what service, not merely in our book of Common Prayer, but in the Liturgical Offices of the Greek or Latin Churches, can stand a competition with it in beauty of language, piety of sentiment, and sublimity of thought ? Are the inspired passages, with which it begins, cold and disconsolate ; and not rather calculated to cheer and animate ? Are the me-

* See BOSWELL'S Life of Johnson, vol. i. p. 196.

ditations and prayers, with which it closes, of a chilling nature? Are they not on the contrary, pious, affecting, and full of *consolation*? But, in what terms shall I join in the admiration, which the elegiac strains of David, and one of the grandest specimens of St. Paul's eloquence have always acquired for it? In short, whether our Service for the dead be taken as a whole, or viewed in detached parts; nothing can less deserve to be called "*cold and disconsolate*." For, as the Resurrection of the dead is the *foundation* of our faith, and the *pillar* of our hope; so, by this Service is our faith strengthened and our hope encouraged, that by well-doing here, we shall be happy hereafter. And while it instructs us not to be sorry as those, "who have no hope," it tends to soothe our anguish for our departed friends. Our Service, it is true, does not prescribe the use of holy water, and incense at the grave; a benediction over it, or intercession for the dead: but with justice, because such ceremonies are vain and superstitious. But, instead of them, it supplies us with beautiful illustrations of the shortness and uncertainty of life; it teaches us to repose our dependence on God; to confess that by our sins we have offended Him; and, in a word, to turn our whole attention to the state of our own souls. It is *thus* we show a regard for our departed friends, and not as Doctor Milner im-

putes to us, * “*by costly pomp and feathered pageantry;*” it is by the regard we shew ourselves. And it is thus, while the Compilers of our Liturgy have guarded us on the one hand, from gross superstition, and on the other, from gloomy despondency; that they have bequeathed us a Service, which breathes the very fervour of piety, consistent with reason, and sanctioned by Scripture.

* LETTER xliii. p. 114.

CHAPTER XII.

EXTREME UNCTION.

I SHOULD not here advert to the doctrine of Extreme Unction, but leave it as it had been determined by Bishops Burnet, Porteus, and Tomline, as relating to the miraculous restoration of the sick to health, were it not for the misapplication, which Doctor Milner makes of our Church Catechism. The reader must know that the passage by which the Popish Church establishes its sacrament of Extreme Unction, occurs in St. James's Epistle General, and is to the following effect.—* “Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick :”—that is, the recovery of health will be the consequence of the appointed prayers. Accordingly, we see that the act of anointing, spoken of in the Gospel, was only one of those circumstances attendant on the performance of a miracle; as when our Saviour † “anointed the eyes of the

* JAMES, v. 14, 15.

† JOHN, ix. 6.

blind man with clay :” whereas it is never productive of such a consequence in the Popish Church, and is but seldom resorted to by it, except when all hopes of recovery are at an end. This marks the wide difference between the Apostolic and the Popish practice, and their effects.

But to come to the question of Extreme Unction being a Sacrament. There being a symbolical action, that is, the “outward visible sign,” it necessarily follows, in Doctor Milner’s opinion, that there is an accompanying “inward spiritual grace; which is,” he says, * “*all that is requisite*, according to the English Protestant Catechism, to constitute a Sacrament.” All that is requisite! Well: before we proceed further, let us inquire, where is the proof of this “inward spiritual grace?” Doctor Milner will reply, in “the saving of the sick, and the forgiveness of his sins.” But this is assertion, and not proof; first, because the *recovery* of the sick, which the words, “*saving* of the sick,” imply, does not immediately follow the application of the oil; and secondly, because the forgiveness of sins can be as well had by the absolution of the priest;—circumstances which directly negative his assertion.

The answer which our Church Catechism

* LETTER xliv. p. 116.

gives to the question respecting the meaning of the word Sacrament, is next to be considered. By it we are to understand, that it is not only “an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace;” but further, that it is “ordained by Christ himself.” I have admitted, that there is an outward sign, and proved, from Doctor Milner’s own explanation, that the second requisite is *absent*. But there is still a grand obstacle to be overcome, even supposing, that Extreme Unction possesses both the fore-mentioned essential requisites of a sacrament; I allude to that part of the answer, which speaks of the “sign” being “*ordained by Christ HIMSELF.*” This difficulty Doctor M. endeavours to get rid of, first, by paraphrasing these last words thus: “there is the ordination of Christ, as the *means* by which the same *is received* ;” and next, by attaching a new import to this paraphrase, quite opposite to the sense in which the Church of England understands the original words in the Catechism. “There is the *ordination* of Christ,” says he; that is, as St. James was ordained to the Apostolic office, he consequently had the *power* to institute a Sacrament! This is what I understand him to mean, when, after the last cited words, he adds, “unless it be alleged, that the holy Apostle *fabricated* a Sacrament, or means of grace, without *any* authority for this purpose from his heavenly

Master." Thus it turns out, notwithstanding the ingenuity of the Paraphrast, that the Popish sacrament of Extreme Unction *has not* all that is requisite to constitute a Sacrament, *according to our catechism*; because, it wants that indispensable requisite, the sanction of Christ Himself; because it is of human, and not of divine institution; and has not, as our twenty-fifth Article expresses it, "any visible sign or ceremony, ORDAINED OF GOD."

CHAPTER XIII.

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS, AND WORSHIP OF
IMAGES,—BLASPHEMOUS AND IDOLATROUS.

DOCTOR MILNER says with truth, * “ that the first and most heavy charge which Protestants bring against (Roman) Catholics is that of IDOLATRY ;” for, of all controversial points, this is one of the most important, and what places us at the farthest distance from each other. We may, in this particular, indeed, be said to be in opposite hemispheres. On other occasions, the Council of Trent appeals to Scripture and tradition conjointly ; sometimes to tradition alone ; but if it founded its decree about Relics and Saints on tradition only, it is on *such* tradition as the Council does not even call *apostolical*. This, therefore, marks the broad distinction, which exists between the Churches of England and Rome ; inasmuch as the doctrine which the one has established on such insufficient grounds, is necessarily rejected by the other, “ as a foolish, vain, and false invention !”

* LETTER xxxiii. p. 14.

As it is alleged by Doctor Milner, that the charge of idolatry has caused Protestant controvertists to oppose and misrepresent the doctrine of his Church, and that “in fact, their cause has not a leg to stand on,” if misrepresentation be taken away; I shall, for the purpose of removing every ground of complaint on his part, defer with him to the expressed and implied sense of those very documents, to which he so confidently appeals. I allude to the Trent decree about Relics and Saints; the Catechism published by Pope Pius V.; and the first Popish Catechism which appeared in English.

First, the decree says, * “that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the Saints, *and to have recourse to their prayers, help, and assistance to obtain favours from God,*” &c. The words in italics are not, as the reader perceives, in the original. But, be this as it may, the Doctor argues from this passage, that the Council only teaches, that it is “*good and profitable*” to invoke the saints; but that it does not *insist* on the *necessity* of invoking them, “there being no positive law of the Church *incumbent* on all her children to pray to them.” But, Invocation is said to be more than simply good and profitable; it is *profitable* according

* “*Bonum atque utile suppliciter eos invocare; et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per Filium ejus.*”—SESS. XXV. de Invoc.

to Doctor Milner's gloss, "to have recourse to their prayers, help, and assistance;" and it is further profitable "to obtain favours from God, through his Son, Jesus Christ;" that is, the Invocation of Saints is profitable to bring about man's salvation! Now, if this be not making it an *article of faith*, and a positive law of the Church, I cannot see what an article of faith means.

Again, the part of the decree relating to Invocation consists of four mandates; the *first*, which regards the Invocation of Saints, ends with a *condemning* clause (**impie sentire*); the *second*, about the honour due to the relics of Saints, ends with a condemning clause (*damnat ecclesia*); the *third*, about the veneration of images, ends with an admonition (*esse sanctum*); and the last division about the use of images and pictures, concludes with a *curse*, that should † "any one teach or *think* contrary to this decree, let him be ANATHEMA." When, therefore, it is imperative on the Bishops and Priests, by virtue of this ordinance, to teach, that the Saints *should* be invoked, and *curses* those who should inculcate any thing contrary thereto; the Council must have considered such Invocation as *necessary* to salvation.

* SESS. XXV.

† "Si quis autem his decretis contraria docuerit aut *senserit*, ANATHEMA SIT."—*IBID.*

When Doctor Milner says, that it is *not* incumbent on any Roman Catholic to pray to the Saints ; he adds, * “ nevertheless, what member *will* fail to communicate with his brethren of the Church triumphant ? ” But, he should have said, what member *dare* fail to communicate with it. For, as I understand the decree, it is not left to the discretion of the individual, whether he abstain from a duty which it pronounces to be useful, to obtain favours from God (*ob beneficia impetranda*), through his Son ; nor does it exempt from its operation those sober interpreters—Petavius, Suarez, Wallenburg, &c., who have inferred, that there is no positive law of the Church, obligatory on its children to pray to the Saints ; for the Anathema is levelled as much against those, who do not *think* in conformity with the decree, as against its direct opposers.

Secondly, the Catechism of Pope Pius V. is a mere echo of the Tridentine decree, † “ We

* LETTER xxxiii. p. 22.

† On the decree are founded the eighth and ninth articles of the Trent Creed. Thus, “ the saints who reign together with Christ are to be venerated and invoked, and as they *offer* prayers for us to God, their *relics* are to be venerated.”—And “ the images of Christ, and the ever-Virgin Mother of God, as also of the other saints, are to be had and retained ; and that due honour and veneration are to be shewn to them.” This profession of faith, *out of which no man can be saved*, each Roman Catholic clergyman, when beneficed, is bound to sub-

beg of the Saints, because they are pleasing to God, that they would be our *advocates*, and obtain from God what we stand in need of." This is a direct admission of the mediation of the Saints; *profitable*, as in the former case, to obtain favours from God, and *profitable* also for an end, which is mainly conducive to man's salvation.

Lastly, the first English Catechism of the Popish Church says, * "we are to honour saints and angels as God's special friends and servants, but not with the honour which belongs to God." This is somewhat milder than the Pope's Catechism; but any one of the three documents produced by Doctor Milner, inculcates doctrines and rules of worship in a more decent manner, than what appear in the Roman Missal. So that it is not from the public formularies of the Church of Rome, that we can derive the justest notions of its doctrines; but from its daily practice and its general observances. Accordingly, the Collects in the Missal rest the hope of salvation on the merits and intercession of the Saints, rather than on the *merits* and *mediation* of Christ. Thus, on the appropriate day of the tutelary Saint of Ireland, God is entreated "to grant, that by *his* inter-

scribe, and sworn to uphold, to the last moment of his existence!

* LETTER xxxiii. p. 16.

cession and merits, we may through his mercy be enabled to perform what he commands." Thomas à Becket's merits seem not only to have exceeded those of the other Saints, but to have superseded those of Christ himself.

* Doctor Milner himself recommends a special devotion to the Virgin Mary. Other instances of the kind are too numerous for insertion here. From all which we may perceive, that the Saints are not merely invoked as intercessors; they are *directly* addressed for grace, assistance, and safety, which God only can bestow. Now, would a Saint be addressed in prayer, if he were thought unable to give that assistance for which he was asked? We may fairly suppose—not. Our Homilies, therefore, say, that it is in this faith, in which the blasphemy of such Invocation consists. That on prayer directs † "that we must only and solely pray unto God; for to say, that we should believe either in Angels or Saints, or in any other living creature, were most horrible *blasphemy* against God and his holy word." Hence it appears, that however plausible the theory, and with whatever art, the doctrine about the Invocation of Saints and the worship of Images and Relics is laid down and defined in the Trent Canons

* Pastoral Letter, 1803.

† Book of Homilies, p. 273, Oxford Ed. 1802.

and Catechism ; yet it is from the practical application of the rules alone, and from the customs, institutions and observances, which are in common use in the church of Rome, that we can understand the *true* import of the terms employed in those rules. It was thus, that the framers of those Canons endeavoured to avoid the imputation of Idolatry in the * philosophical sense of the word, as they could not do so in the scriptural sense. However, the practice is idolatrical as much in one sense, as in the other.

If, as the above-cited Homily says, Invocation be a thing *proper* to God, it must be absolute Idolatry, however explained and recommended by the Trent Canons, to give to the creature that honour, which is only due to the Creator. Nor, can all the sophistry of the church of Rome, nor all the address, with which it disguises its doctrines, justify the common practices of individuals in this respect. So that, supposing such men as Doctor Milner to be able to preserve the nice metaphysical distinction, which is so artfully drawn between the honour due to God and his Saints, or their Images ; yet it is not to be expected, nor indeed does it ever happen, that the unlettered peasant will carry his thoughts beyond the Saint he invokes, or the *material* object to which his devotion is directed. Will he

* MOSH. Eccl. Hist. vol. iv. p. 213.

not rather imagine, when he prostrates himself before the images of the Saints, that they are, as it were, the places of their habitation? Does he in this respect differ from the poor heathen, who, guided only by the light of nature, adores his image of wood, or stone? But, although I say this, I am far from supposing, that the learned and acute Doctor is more exempt from the charge of Idolatry, than the ignorant and besotted devotee; because my Church informs me, that there can be *no* distinction. Indeed, if there be an exception, it must be in favour of the latter. * “Not only,” says the Homily against the peril of Idolatry, “the unlearned and simple, but the *learned* and *wise*; not the people only, but the *Bishops*; not the sheep, but also *the* *Shepherds* themselves, who should have been lights to shine in darkness, being blinded by the bewitchings of images, as blind guides of the blind, fell *both* into the pit of damnable idolatry.”

It is, therefore, idle in Doctor Milner to contend, that he himself restricts *divine adoration* to God, and that he merely honours the Saints and pious images with a relative or *secondary* worship; or, to carp at the † Bishop of Durham for preferring a charge of blasphemy against the Church of Rome, for invoking the media-

* HOM. p. 201.

† Sermons, p. 442.

tion of Saints. The act of invocation is in itself *idolatrous*; and therefore *blasphemous*, because it is idolatrous: however intended by himself, or modified by his Church. *Belief* in the efficacy of invoking Saints may be a delusion; yet that does not remove the Idolatry incurred by the Invocation. Thus our Church further declares, * “ that idolatry standeth chiefly *in the mind*, that our image maintainers have had, and have the same opinions and judgments of Saints and that they use the same outward rites and manner of worshipping their images, as the Gentiles did use their idols; and that, therefore, they commit idolatry, as well *inwardly* and *outwardly*, as did the wicked Gentiles Idolaters.”

But, as the ability of the Saints to hear all those, who invoke their mediation, implies the attribute of *universal presence*, and as there is no possibility of knowing, or cause for thinking, that they possess any such power; Doctor Milner, in order to extricate himself from this difficulty, asks by way of recrimination,—since † “ it appears that our Church believes in the existence and efficacy of sorcery, enchantment, and witchcraft; whether we, therefore, ascribe the divine attribute of *universal presence* to the devil?” Here is the misstatement of a fact, no

* HOM. p. 187.

† LETTER xxxiii. p. 20.

less than a perversion of the very authority referred to in support of it. Because the belief of the Church of England, on this head, is the very opposite to that ascribed to it by Doctor Milner; while both the * Articles and Injunctions issued by Queen Elizabeth, instead of countenancing, expressly condemn those demoniacal conceits. Thus the 37th *Article*, or subject of inquiry, to be made by the clergy in their respective parishes, was to ascertain, “whether you know any that do use charms, enchantments, witchcraft, &c.” in order to their prevention; while the 32nd Injunction desires, “that no person shall at any time resort to the *same* (viz. *charms*, &c.) for counsel, or for help.” How Doctor Milner could find nerve to bring forward these documents, in proof that our Church believes in the efficacy of sorceries, and the like, is more than I am able to account for!

Doctor Milner's other objections respecting Queen Elizabeth's retaining the crucifix in her chapel, the elevation of the cross at the top of St. Paul's, and carved images in Westminster Abbey, are scarcely deserving of notice. He might, if he pleased, have added, that the † historians, who speak of the crucifix, tell us

* See BISHOP SPARROW's Collection of Articles and Injunctions, published in 1559, pp. 78 and 150.

† STRYPE and BURNET.

that her Majesty likewise observed another Popish custom—that of having lighted tapers on the altar, during divine service. We perceive too that she had so strong * a predilection for images, that it was with difficulty subdued by Archbishop Parker and the other Prelates. But this shews nothing more than the influence of Popish prejudices on her mind, and that she had not proceeded on the same pure principles of Christianity, by which the conduct of the pious and enlightened Edward had been regulated. However all this has nothing to do with the agitated point. For Doctor Milner must know, that it is not the having images in churches and chapels, which is forbidden by the commandment, but the conversion of them to a religious use; and that, as far as Protestants are concerned, they may remain in harmless repose in their niches, only to be gazed on by the curious, either as models of ancient sculpture, or as giving uniformity to the venerable fabrics, in which they were originally placed.

But neither is our Church silent about the consequence of permitting Images to remain in places of divine worship. The Homily, so of-

* The 35th Injunction forbade “images and other monuments of Idolatry to be kept in houses;” which accords with the bias of the Queen’s mind, about retaining them in places of public worship.

ten quoted, says, * “ if it should be admitted, that although Images were suffered in Churches, yet might idolatry, by diligent and sincere preaching of God’s word, be avoided.” Here is Doctor Milner’s objection anticipated. But the same Homily explains it away, and shews that no two cases ever bore less resemblance ; for it subsequently adds, † “ that Idolatry *cannot possibly be separated* from Images any long time ; but that, as an inseparable accident, or as a shadow followeth the body when the sun shineth, so idolatry followeth and cleaveth to the public having of images in temples.” Here it is stated that the having of images in temples is not idolatry ; but that their *continuance* for religious purposes “ cannot be *without* idolatry.” But what else is this idolatry, but the INVOCATION of the images themselves, or of the saints represented by them ? In this decided tone do those venerable Reformers, who composed our Homilies, speak of the perils of idolatry. They had been themselves members of the church of Rome, and although intimately acquainted both with its precepts and practice, and with the doctrine of the Invocation as recommended and intended by it, they yet admitted no distinction ; but condemned both, in the most unqualified terms, as equally idolatrous. Our own experi-

* HOM. against the peril of Idolatry, p. 199.

† IBID.

ence can fully appreciate the value of their authority; for what Popery was in their time, it continues to be at the present day, as the bar, which the practice of Invocation interposes to the admission of Roman Catholics to Parliament, sufficiently testifies.

As if to justify the Popish custom of kneeling and prostration before the images of the Saints, and praying to them in those postures, Doctor Milner objects to us the ceremony in our Church of *kneeling* at the altar. He asks, whether we do not oblige those who frequent the Sacrament, * “to kneel and prostrate themselves before it, at which time it is to be supposed they lift up their eyes to it, and say their prayers.” Protestants kneel, but there is no *prostration*; because kneeling is a reverential way of acknowledging the benefits derived from the death and passion of our Redeemer. If, when we knelt at the altar, we thought we thereby worshipped the consecrated bread and wine, the practice would, no doubt, be idolatrous, and in that respect both churches would be on a level. But, since the adoration of the Host rests on the belief, that as soon as the elements are consecrated, Christ is present, as well after a *corporeal* as a spiritual manner, and as our Church entirely rejects this tenet; our kneeling has *no resemblance* to the kneeling in

* LETTER xxxiv. p. 25.

the Church of Rome. There can, therefore, be no ground for Doctor Milner's insinuation, that because we may *lift up* our eyes to the Sacrament, we therefore worship the consecrated elements. Besides, he well knows that even the Popish Church itself never affected to worship the *mere* bread and wine, detached from the corporeal presence. Neither is our kneeling at the Sacrament a superstitious ceremony; unless it should be impiously said, that Christ himself was guilty of superstition, when, after he had instituted it, he withdrew from his apostles, * "and kneeled down and prayed;" or, without imputing superstition to † Saints Peter and Paul, as well as to the prophets of the Old Testament. It is equally frivolous in Doctor Milner to object, on the part of the Dissenters, that when the name of JESUS is pronounced in any lesson, we revere it ‡ "with all lowli-

* Luke, xxii. 41.

† Acts, ix. 40; and xx. 36.

‡ This expression in the Injunctions of 1559 (No. 52.), is fully explained by our 18th Canon, which says, "when in time of Divine Service the LORD JESUS shall be *mentioned*, due and *lowly reverence* shall be done by all persons present testifying, by these outward gestures, *their inward humility, Christian resolution,*" &c. I have cited the Injunctions and the 18th Canon particularly; because Doctor Milner affects to say, that these documents furnish grounds for the outcry raised by the Dissenters, on the score of *Idolatry*, against the Established Church! But, affording to the objections of our Protestant brethren their full weight, they neither impeach the Church of England on this head; nor warrant the infer-

ness of courtesie and uncovering the heads ;” inasmuch as * St. Paul has declared, that it is an act of reverence to our Blessed Lord, that at the mention of his name, “ every knee *should bow.*”

† “ It is a gross calumny,” says Doctor Milner, “ to pretend that *we suppress* any part of the Decalogue ; for the whole of it appears in all our Bibles, and in all our *most approved* Catechisms.” With respect to the Bible, it may be put entirely out of the question, inasmuch as that is a sealed book to the Popish laity. But what will the reader think of this positive assertion, to deny which is a *gross calumny* ; when he is told, that the ‡ Catechism in greatest circulation in this country, is one, in which, after being *revised, enlarged, approved,* and re-

ence drawn of a similarity of practice existing between it and the Church of Rome. So consistent is our Church throughout, that, in the *Rubric* at the end of the Communion service, it tells us, that kneeling “ is meant for a *signification* of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ ; and, lest it should by any persons be misconstrued and depraved, it is declared, that thereby *no adoration* is intended ; and that therefore, the elements *are not to be adored*, for that were *idolatry* to be ABHORRED of all faithful Christians.” The act of kneeling is therefore simply prescribed, as being most congenial with those feelings of humility, which our prayers are calculated to inspire.

* Phil. ii. 10.

† LETTER xxxiv. p. 31.

‡ By the most Rev. Dr. James Butler, titular Archbishop of Cashel, Cork edit. 1810. p. 23.

commended by the four titular Archbishops, as a *general* Catechism for Ireland, the second commandment is *suppressed*, and the tenth *divided* into two parts? The Decalogue also may be preserved entire in the Trent and Douay Catechisms; but even that will not profit the Irish people. Will it not rather be productive of the greatest mischief, that the idolatry of their Church should be screened by so important an omission as that of a commandment, and themselves imperceptibly led away from the worship of God to the worship of images; or, as it is tenderly called by Doctor Milner, to the *relative* or *secondary* veneration of them? Here is additional proof, that, however guarded and defended by decrees; or, however enveloped and disguised by explanations; notwithstanding all its artifice and contrivance, the common practices and usages of the Church of Rome are *idolatrous*.

The plea which he sets up for the division of the tenth commandment is this; that in the original Hebrew, there was * “*no mark* of separation between one commandment and another; so that there were no rules by which to be guided, but the sense of the context.” But the futility of this plea is evident on his own statement; because, in the absence of every kind of

* LETTER XXXIV. p. 31.

distinguishing mark between the commandments, no other rule *could* exist for determining, whether there should be *any*, and *what* division of the context, than *its own meaning*. To illustrate this in English.

“ *Thou shalt HAVE no other Gods before me thou shalt not MAKE to thee any graven image or any likeness of any thing, &c. &c.*”

“ *Thou shalt not COVET thy neighbour's house thou shalt not COVET thy neighbour's wife, &c. &c.*”

As the * context is here given without mark

* The late Granville Sharp, in his elaborate REMARKS on the Irish Roman Catholic Catechism, p. 24—47, specifies the year 1530 as the precise period, at which the original Hebrew of the decalogue was tampered with. “At that time,” he observes, “that a full stop was placed after the *second* commandment, and not after the first, in order to warrant its omission in the Popish catechisms. A full stop was also placed after the *first clause* of the tenth commandment, as it stands in Deuteronomy ; thus affording a colour for completing the numbers rendered deficient by the suppression of the second. But, as this division was not made in the corresponding text in Exodus, the interpolation became more palpable. And thus the providential variation of expression in the two parallel texts, has rendered the division of the tenth commandment into two, a matter of impossibility.” Such are the operating causes of Doctor Milner's forced appeal to the sense of the Hebrew context, and of his consequent acknowledgment of a standard, which has been shewn to militate against the suppression of the second, and the division of the tenth commandment. Yet, his is but the admission of an individual ; and although every member of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy

or stop, it is submitted to the reader's judgment, whether it does not rather demand a separation between those clauses, which forbid *different* things, than that it should take place between those, which referred to *one* and the *same* thing. That is, that the clause which related to 'other Gods,' should form a distinct commandment from that, which related 'to graven images,' on account of the variance in the expressions, *thou shalt HAVE*, and *thou shalt not MAKE*; while the clauses, which relate to *coveting* generally, should form *one indivisible* commandment, as *one* and the *same* verb is used in both.

But, besides, let the reader compare *Exodus*, xx. 17. with *Deuteronomy*, v. 21. and he must consider the * variation between them to have been wisely designed by Providence for the exposure of the fraud, which has been since practised. Thus, in *Exodus*, the clause relating to the neighbour's wife occurs *second*, and in *Deu-*

in the United Kingdom should individually admit the same thing, it would not be received as the voice of the Church, but as so many distinct opinions. The second commandment would not, on that account, be restored to the Catechetical Decalogue, nor would "*pious images*" cease to be worshipped by Roman Catholics!

* The Council of Trent, aware of the difficulty arising from this circumstance, gave that which stands as our tenth commandment, the common title of the NINTH AND TENTH Commandments!—REMARKS ut supra.

teronomy, *first*, in order. Can there be a plainer proof than this, that God, foreseeing the perversion of his commands, intended that there should be *no* division in that which relates to *coveting*, but that it should form *one* distinct commandment; while that which relates to a *graven image*; or, as the Douay Version has it, a *graven thing*, (as if an image were not a thing, and therefore that *making an image* was not prohibited by the commandment) should neither be suppressed, nor yet moulded into the command about *having* no other than the true God? Reader, examine and judge!

CHAPTER XIV.

ANTICHRIST.

WHAT Doctor Milner calls "*contradictions*" among learned Protestants, should be rather called disagreements, about the period of the rise of Antichrist; since all are agreed in one particular point—namely, that the Pope is that character. Apostacy is the *first* Antichristian mark, which accompanied the revelation of the * *man of sin*. The second mark of Antichrist, St. Paul likewise says, is, that he † "*opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the Temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.*" And the *third* mark relates to his being one, ‡ "*whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all powers and signs, and lying wonders.*" Those three characteristic marks of Antichrist, which Protestant writers have invariably ascribed to the chief Pastor of the church of Rome, are declared by Doctor Milner to be totally inapplicable to him, and to be descriptive rather of § "that class of religionists," allu-

* 2 THESS. ii. 3.

† IBID. ii. 4.

‡ IBID. ii. 9.

§ LETTER xlv. p. 125.

ding to the members of the Church of England, “who have fallen off from the true church.” But in what does this imputed *apostacy* of our church consist? In its abandonment of a corrupt church? This is not apostacy, for apostacy implies sin; whereas it would have been sinful to have continued in connexion with a church, which had itself fallen off from the truth; when an opportunity for leaving it occurred. It therefore follows, that the Church of England has no Antichristian mark, and that it is not that *Antichristian* power to which the prophetic marks peculiarly belong; and as they *all* exclusively apply to the Pope and the Papal Church, their united character must be St. Paul’s *Man of Sin*, that is, the *Antichrist*.

It is unnecessary to prove here, that the church of Rome has apostatized and departed from * “the faith once delivered to the Saints;” as every page of this book is replete with evidence to that effect. I therefore consider the application of the *first* Antichristian mark to that church as established. The self-abasement which the Pope observes in the performance of his religious exercises, and which Doctor Milner brings forward as a proof of the *second* Antichristian mark being inapplicable to him, is perfectly compatible with that lordly pre-emi-

* JUDE, 3.

nence, which he arrogates to himself over the Christian Church. Is not the assumption of universal dominion over kingdoms and nations an act of Antichristian arrogance, whether exercised by a * Hildebrand, or a Pius the Seventh, and does it not exactly accord with what St. Paul says of *him*, “who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God?” This *second* Antichristian mark, therefore, applies to Papal Rome equally with the first. And, as I conceive, that there are *no* true miracles wrought in the Church of Rome, I may as a member of the Church of England, safely acquiesce in its judgment, when speaking of the pretended miracles of its corrupt sister; that † “the Scriptures have for a warning hereof foreshewed, *that the kingdom of ANTICHRIST shall be mighty in miracles and wonders, to the strong illusion of all the reprobates.*” Hence it inevitably follows, that this *third* Antichristian mark is equally descriptive of the same character.

But it is not in *apostacy, pride, and false miracles* alone, that the Church of Rome is Anti-

* The German Clergy, A.D. 1080, accused this despotic Pope with being an *apostate* Monk and a *sorcerer*; which appellations imply two of the *Antichristian* marks. The words they used were “*falsus monachus, divinaculus, somniorum prodigiorumque conector, manifestus necromanticus.*”—VILLERS on the Reformation, p. 465.

† HOMILY against peril of Idolatry, p. 195.

christian ; it is equally so in its *image worship*, and in its *superfluous decking of churches*, which our Church also pronounces * “ to be a token of *Antichrist*’s kingdom ; who, as the prophet foresheweth, shall worship God with such gorgeous things.” Here too are we authorised to consider the Pope *Antichrist*, and the Church of Rome the *Antichristian* power.

In one point, Doctor Milner and I are agreed ; namely, that the Socinian, who denies the *Messiahship*, or the *Divinity* of the Son of God, is an *Antichrist*. St. John says, that he † “ who confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is a deceiver and an *Antichrist* :” and that ‡ “ he is *Antichrist*, that denieth the Father and the Son.” We find the Antichristian character ascribed to *Simon Magus* at a very early period of Christianity. He is said to have been honoured by many as God, and to have given himself out as being the SON, among the Jews ; the FATHER in Samaria ; and that he descended from Heaven among the Gentiles as the HOLY GHOST. But those individuals are not the only Antichrists, or enemies to Christ and his religion ; for, Antichrist and his ministers are not the open, but *concealed* foes of Christ, who, in his name, give him opposition ; and while only *one* of the prophetic marks applies to each

* IBID. p. 214.

† 2 Epistle, 7.

‡ 1 Epistle, ii. 22.

of those alluded to, we may perceive *all* attach to the Pope, as *the Man of Sin*, and to the Church of Rome, as the *Antichristian* power.

With respect to the Pope's temporal power, Doctor Milner is very reserved in his observations; but we may, however, collect his opinion from what Bellarmine, the great oracle of his Church, advances on the subject. Speaking of the Pope, he says, that as the * “*delegate of Christ, he obtains jurisdiction over all Emperors and Kings.*” In the Commentaries on the Canon Law, corrected and edited under the auspices of Pope Gregory XIII., he is called † *our Lord God*. Downham, after relating this circumstance, adds, that the Pope “receives adoration of which St. Peter *would not* accept.” The usual titles of the Pope are the ‡ *Vicar of God*, the *Vicar of Christ*, the *Vicar General of God on earth*, and *Head of Christendom*. He also declares, in his common rescripts and bulls, that God has appointed him *supreme* Ruler over the whole Christian Church. “He truly sets himself up as God,” says § Simplicius, “who boasts that he rules the Church at *his own* discretion, enacts laws, and dissolves those

* POL. SYNOPS. in loc.—IBID. vol. iv. Pars posterior, p. 986 ad calc.

† IBID. p. 987.

‡ *Vicarius Dei; Vic. Christi; Vic. Gen. Dei in terris, &c.*—IB.

§ IBID. in THESS. p. 988.

of *divine* origin, and shuts or opens the gates of heaven *as he pleases*; that he cannot err, who is daily called *our most holy Lord*, with no less impiety than what was formerly said of Domitian, *our Lord God ordered it to be done thus.*" The blasphemous salutations with which the Italian populace greeted the present Pope on his way to Savonne plainly shew, that there has been no abatement in pontifical pride. For, he gave them his benediction, as the narrator states, * "*amidst* acclamations of *long live JESUS CHRIST and HIS REPRESENTATIVE on earth.*"

The Scriptures inform us, that † "*the Lord only is Holy*;" yet, in opposition to this sacred authority, does the Pope, as if he possessed the highest degree of all holiness, assume the blasphemous and high-sounding titles of *MOST holy Lord, MOST Holy Father, RULER of the world, FATHER of Princes and Kings.* But, in the assumption of his other title of ‡ *PON-*

* Plus de 16,000 individus de tout sexe et de tout age s'étaient rendus en cet endroit pour jouir du bonheur de voir sa Sainteté, lorsqu'à 6 heures elle a paru et donné sa bénédiction aux acclamations de *Vive Jésus Christ, et son représentant sur la terre!*—RELATION de ce qui s'est passé à Rome, &c. Vol. iii. p. 122.

† Revel. xv. 4.

‡ The origin of the word, *Pontifex*, has been traced by the ingenious Mr. Bryant (*ANALYSIS of Ancient Mythology*, vol. iii. p. 121.) to the words *Panti*, or *Ponti*, in the Amonian language. Mr. Granville Sharp has further refined on his principle by discovering its root to lie in a Greek or Latin

TIFEX MAXIMUS, we can find little difficulty in perceiving the resemblance between him and the prophetical character of Antichrist.

As connected with the subject of the Antichristian character of Papal Rome, it only remains for me to advert to the mysterious number 666, which, Doctor Milner says, * “many Protestant expounders have *endeavoured* to extract from the name or title of certain Popes; but which ingenious (Roman) Catholics *have* extracted from *Martinus Lutherus* and *David Chrythæus*.” It is true, that that exact number has been found in several names; but no name, although it may possibly include it, can be the

soil. Thus, says he, “the Latins might have conceived that *Ponti* had some allusion to *Pons*, a bridge, which might occasion the ludicrous inauguration of the ancient *Pontifex Maximus* under a wooden bridge, built over a dry ditch near Rome, and bored full of holes.”—REMARKS, p. 70. But, whichsoever be right, it appears certain, that the Pontificate was alone held by the Roman Emperors, from the time of Augustus to that of Augustulus; that it was annexed by the former to the imperial titles of the Roman Cæsars, and only became extinct when this last of the Western Emperors ceased to reign. So that, towards the conclusion of the fifth century, and not before, was this *Pagan* title, this *characteristic* mark of the *Man of Sin*, this fatal distinction of *pagan* apostacy, and *idolatrous pre-eminence*, claimed by the Bishops of Rome, as may be seen in Pope Gelasius’s letter (VANDALE’S DISSERT. ix. p. 192.) to the Greek Emperor Anastasius, in which he speaks of the sacred authority of the *Pontiffs*.—See also DECLINE and FALL, vol. iii. p. 291.

* LETTER xlv. p. 129.

apocalyptic name of the beast ; unless it correspond in all other respects to the prophetic description of that name. Thus, Martin * *Lauter* not *Lutherus*, as Dr. Milner has it, produces the number in *Saxon* ; David Chitræus and Beza *antitheus* in *Greek*, and John Calvin in *Hebrew*. But as the other particulars of the beast are not discovered in those names, the resemblance is lost. The number 666 has been discovered in two of the Papal titles, viz :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{V} & \text{I} & \text{C} & \text{A} & \text{R} & \text{I} & \text{V} & \text{S} & & \text{F} & \text{I} & \text{L} & \text{I} & \text{I} & & \text{D} & \text{E} & \text{I}, \\ \frac{5}{5} & \frac{1}{1} & \frac{100}{100} & & \frac{1}{1} & \frac{5}{5} & & & & \frac{1}{1} & \frac{50}{50} & \frac{1}{1} & \frac{1}{1} & \frac{500}{500} & \frac{1}{1} & = 66 & \text{and} \\ \text{V} & \text{I} & \text{C} & \text{A} & \text{R} & \text{I} & \text{V} & \text{S} & \text{general} & \text{I} & \text{S} & \text{D} & \text{E} & \text{I} & \text{I} & \text{n} & \text{t} & \text{e} & \text{r} & \text{I} & \text{S}. \\ \frac{5}{5} & \frac{1}{1} & \frac{100}{100} & & \frac{1}{1} & \frac{5}{5} & & & & \frac{50}{50} & \frac{1}{1} & \frac{500}{500} & \frac{1}{1} & \frac{1}{1} & & = 666 \end{array}$$

But neither of these can be the name intended by the Apostle, because, † *neither* of them is the name of the temporal beast ; *neither* of them is the proper name of a man ; and *neither* of them can be obviously borne by each individual Roman Catholic. The Hebrew word רומיית *Romiith* has been discovered to contain the same number † 666 ; but this is as inapplicable as either of the two former, and for the reasons which I have already stated. Hence, Doctor Milner may perceive that the talents of the expounders on both

* LOWMAN'S Paraph. in loc.

† See FABER on the Prophecies, vol. ii. p. 33.

‡ The apocalyptic number has been thus explained ; 666 = 1453—787, namely, the period at which the second Council of Nice established Image worship. See REV. DR. BARRET'S Letter on the Hebrew Medal found near Cork.

sides of the question have thus far been exercised in vain. But the idea has been suggested, and that by *a Protestant writer, that λατρινος is the name of that particular man, in whose appellation is found the same number as the name of the beast; for,

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} \dagger & \text{A} & \text{A} & \text{T} & \text{E} & \text{I} & \text{N} & \text{O} & \Sigma \\ & 30 & 1 & 300 & 5 & 10 & 50 & 70 & 200 = 666 \end{array}$$

is at once the *name* of a man, the *title* of an Empire, and the *distinguishing appellation* of every individual in that Empire. The Apostle wrote in Greek; it is therefore morally certain, that he intended, that the calculation should not be made in a different language. As it will baffle the ingenuity of Doctor Milner to bring home so many and such strong distinguishing marks of an *Antichristian* character, against *Martin Luther*, with all "his anagrams and chronograms," we must unavoidably conclude that the Pope is

ANTICHRIST.

* See GRANVILLE SHARP'S Appendix to three tracts, p. 126.

† Doctor More says, "the Papists *latinize* in every thing, Mass, prayers, hymns, litanies, canons, decretals, bulls are conceived in *Latin*. The Papal Councils speak in *Latin*. The women pray in *Latin*. Nor is the Scripture read in any other language than *Latin*. In short, all things are Latin; the Pope having communicated his language to the people under his dominion, as the mark and character of his Empire."

MYSTERY OF INIQUITY, part 2, book i. c. 15.

CHAPTER XV.

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

HOWEVER offensive it may be to Doctor Milner, I cannot but subscribe to Archbishop Tillotson's opinion, * "that the Pope's supremacy is not only an *indefensible*, but an *impudent* cause; and that while there is not one tolerable argument for it, there are a thousand invincible reasons against it." It is a part of the Ecclesiastical polity of the Church of Rome, but no part of the Popish religion. Scripture, reason, and antiquity, oppose it, while a solitary pretext, a specious but remote one, alone remains to uphold its existence; namely, the necessity of a *visible* head over the whole Church, for the preservation of its unity.

The pre-eminence ascribed to the Bishop of Rome by Doctor Milner, according to which, he is entitled to rank and *jurisdiction*, dignity and *power* superior to other Bishops of the Church of Christ, so as to be † "its spiritual

* Vid. ADDRESS to the reader, prefixed to Barrow's Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy.

† LETTER xlvi. p. 134.

head here, and his see the *centre* of (Roman) Catholic unity," is grounded by him on the following declaration of our Lord, * "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona ; . . . and I say unto thee, that *thou art PETER*, and *upon this ROCK I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" Doctor Milner thus argues, that, as St. Peter was the *Rock* on which the Church was built, it proves, that a *special* dignity and charge was conferred upon him by our Lord in *preference* to the other Apostles ; and that, as the Pope is the representative of St. Peter, who was constituted chief of the Apostles, (*Princeps Apostolorum*,) he must consequently be *Chief* over all Bishops ; whence it is further inferred by him, that the *Pope* possesses *spiritual jurisdiction* over all Bishops, and that he, therefore, possesses it in the Universal Church. But this argument is more shewy than solid. Because, although Peter had been the Rock on which the Church was built, yet that Church was not the Church of Rome, but the Church of *Jerusalem*. This was the *mother* of all Churches ; and, if Doctor Milner's positions were tenable, it might claim to be *mistress* of all Churches. But the Church of Rome was neither the one nor the other. It was (*prima inter pares*) *first* among equals, but

* Matt. xvi. 18.

nothing more. And, as to the preference, which he says was conferred on St. Peter above the other Apostles, *that* St. Paul positively *denies*, when he speaks of himself as not being * “a whit *behind* the very chiefest Apostles,” and of his *withstanding* Peter to his face, † “because he was to be blamed.” And when, at the last supper, there was a strife among the Apostles, as to ‡ “which of them should be accounted the greatest;” it is evident, that this could not have happened, had they supposed that St. Peter possessed a supremacy over them. And it is further evident, that they had not recognized such supremacy, when they § *sent* him with John to settle the Church, and when they subsequently || called him to an account about his ministry. But, that neither he, nor they could have entertained any such notion, appears from our Saviour’s observation, which was so well calculated to put down all worldly distinction and pride. ¶ “He that is *greatest*,” says he, “among you, let him be *as the younger*; and he that is *chief*, as he that doth *serve*.”

With respect to the repetition of our Saviour’s question to Peter, ** “lovest thou me?”—this, according to Doctor Milner, marks a distinction in consequence of Peter’s being called

* 2 Cor. xi. 5.

† Gal. ii. 11.

‡ Luke, xxii. 24.

§ Acts, viii. 14.

|| *IBID.* xi. 2, 3.

¶ Luke, xxii. 26.

** John, xxi. 15.

upon by Christ to declare three several times that *he loved him*, and even, that he loved him *more* than his fellow Apostles. He says, that Peter was further distinguished by being charged to *feed Christ's lambs*; and, at length, * "*to feed his sheep also*, whom the lambs are used to follow." In short, that † "this Apostle was to act the part of a shepherd, not only with respect to the flock in general, but also with respect to *the pastors themselves*." But these questions and injunctions rather imply a distrust in Peter's constancy; for we find that he was grieved, because Christ said unto him the *third* time, "lovest thou me?" while the charge to feed Christ's flock implied the care which was required as the proof of his love, and not a *commission* to exercise supreme authority. And, although Doctor Milner enumerates different points, in which Peter had the precedence; such as being the *first* on the list of the Apostles; the *first* to confess his faith in Christ; the *first* to

* "If it be asked," says Bishop Taylor, "why the Bishop of Rome calls himself Universal Bishop? *Pasce oves* is his warrant. Why he pretends to a power of deposing Princes? *Pasce oves*, said Christ to Peter, a second time. If it be demanded, why also he pretends to a power of authorizing their subjects to kill them? *Pasce agnos*, said Christ, the third time: thus, *pasce* is *doce*, *pasce* is *impera*, and *pasce* is *occide*."—*Dissuasive against Popery*, p. 137.

† LETTER xlv. p. 135.

whom Christ appeared after his Resurrection ; and the *first* to preach the belief of this to the Apostles ; yet, such precedence does not imply Supremacy. The contrary instances, which may be adduced, namely, of his *fallen state* after his unhappy denial of his Lord ; his *infirmity* in not watching, even so much as *one* hour ; the *severe rebuke*, which he drew from our Saviour, when he said, * “ *Get thee behind me, Satan ;* ” and the want of faith with which Christ upbraided him, when † “ he walked on the water,” and began to sink, &c. &c.—tend to shew, that no precedence, implying *power* and *supreme government* in the Church, was intended. And further, were I to concede, which I do not, that St. Peter founded the Church of Rome, and imparted to his successors this precedence of which Doctor Milner speaks ; yet such precedence or primacy is nothing more than what those Bishops, who succeeded to an Apostolic chair in Asia and Greece, had as just a right to claim as the Bishops of Rome.

Doctor Milner contends, that the Popes, as successors of St. Peter, possess the same superiority over *all other* Bishops, which *he* did over the *other* Apostles. But, if this assertion be disproved, his principal argument in favour of the Pope’s Supremacy, is invalidated.

* Matt. xvi. 23.

† IBID. xiv. 29.

In the first place, then, the Acts of the Apostles, as well as St. Peter's Epistles, afford no distinct evidence of his having *ever* been at Rome; although there are strong grounds for supposing that he was there the year preceding his martyrdom. And secondly, when St. Paul wrote to the Romans, he sent no salutation to St. Peter in his Epistle, which it may be presumed he would do, were he at Rome. Nor, in the * different Epistles, which he addressed to the churches in Asia from Rome, does he *once* speak of St. Peter being with him. But in addition to this negative proof, there is direct testimony from St. Paul's own words to the Christian converts in that city, to the same effect. For had a church been established among them by an *Apostle*, he would not have said, that he † “so strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build on *another man's* foundation.” Neither does he make the remotest allusion to the alleged superiority of St. Peter; a further proof, that he did not understand our Saviour's words to convey any such superiority. Moreover, he expressly says, that ‡ “the Gospel of the *uncircumcision* was committed unto me;

* Viz. to the *Colossians*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians* and *Hebrews*. St. Paul also wrote to *Philemon*, and his second Epistle to *Timothy* FROM ROME; yet *never once* mentions St. Peter's name.

† ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἈΛΛΟΤΡΙΟΝ θεμελίον οἰκοδομῶ.—ROM. xv. 20.

‡ GAL. ii. 7.

as the Gospel of *circumcision* was unto Peter." These words go to prove, that if ever Peter were Bishop of Rome, it was only perhaps of the Jewish Christians resident there.

In anticipation of the negative and direct evidence here offered, Doctor Milner flies to the authority of Irenæus, who wrote in the latter part of the second century, and who is the *first* to make mention of St. Peter's co-operation with St. Paul in founding the Church of Rome. That father, referring to the tradition of the Apostles preserved in that Church, calls it * "*the greatest, most ancient, and most universally known*, as having been founded by St. Peter and St. Paul, to which every Church is bound to conform by reason of its *superior authority*." However, on closely examining the value of his testimony, we shall find, that the *precedence* and *jurisdiction*, which Doctor Milner says, he ascribes to the Church of Rome, depended on mere contingencies, and could only be said to have continued so long as the causes, which produced them, existed; and also, that as Irenæus asserts, in one part of his evidence on this subject, what is false, it destroys the

* "*Maximæ et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis, Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ, ad quam convenire necesse est, omnem ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem.*"

credit due to the remainder. *First*, as the city of Rome was the capital of the Roman Empire, it followed, that the Church of Rome would acquire an ascendancy among the Churches of the Empire, and be naturally deferred to, *potior potiore principalitatem*. This one instance too would lead to its being called the *maxima ecclesia*. But where was the fitness of the appellation, when the Roman Empire became extinct ; inasmuch as the Church of Rome could not be said to have retained its pre-eminence, after that event took place? *Secondly*, we have Irenæus *versus* Irenæus ; for if he asserted what is true, in calling the Church of Rome the *greatest* in the Roman Empire, he has asserted what is false, in saying it was the most *ancient* ; because the establishment of the Church of Jerusalem was antecedent to that of the Church of Rome. And as St. James was the first of the Apostles, who presided in a Christian assembly, discharging in a manner the office and duty of a Bishop ; he, and not St. Peter, was the first Christian Bishop. Hence it follows, that our Saviour's words do not imply, that the Church was founded exclusively on St. Peter, and that as they have no reference either to *power* or *authority*, they cannot mean, that any particular Church, or Bishop of such Church, possessed such authority or supremacy over all other Churches. And thus the entire argument for

the Supremacy of the Pope, resting as it does on a misinterpretation of Scripture, falls to the ground. I should observe that Tertullian, Cyprian, and the other writers quoted by Doctor Milner, have, like Irenæus, declared that St. Peter was concerned in establishing the Church of Rome. But their opinion, in all probability, depended on the authority of Irenæus. However this may be, since there is no possibility of reconciling what he says with St. Luke's narrative respecting the Apostles, or with the passages, which I have adduced from St. Paul's Epistles; either Scripture or tradition must give way; for when they are contradictory, *both* cannot be true.

But, the Supremacy of the Pope is not only unsupported by Scripture, it is also contradicted by the evidence of the primitive fathers of the Church. One testimony out of many will suffice to prove this; that of the great Chrysostom, who, in speaking of St. Paul's unbounded authority over the Church of Christ; thus expresses himself: * "to St. Paul was committed the *whole* world. St. Paul had an anxious solicitude for *all* the Churches throughout the world." Again he says, † "no one is greater than St. Paul; no one is *equal* to him. If he laboured more abundantly than the rest of the

* De laudibus Pauli.—Oper. vol. ii. p. 485.

† *IBID.* vol. i. pp. 171, 517.

Apostles, he will be more abundantly rewarded. And as he is *greater* than they, (κακεινων μειζων) it is evident, that he will enjoy *the highest honour* and *first seat* (της ανωτατω τιμης, και προεδριας) among them." St. Paul's superiority is asserted here in very strong terms; yet with such superiority and with such general solicitude about all the Churches, as is ascribed to him, St. Peter's Supremacy and that of the Popes, his reputed successors, is wholly incompatible.

But, continues Doctor Milner, the Churches of England and Rome agree, that "Bishops, in general, succeed to the rank and functions of the Apostles; so, by the same rule, the successor of St. Peter, in the See of Rome, succeeds to his primacy and jurisdiction." We are now first to consider in what light the Popes can be said to be the successors of St. Peter; whether as Apostles, or as Bishops. Not certainly as Apostles; because they neither inherit, nor affect to inherit the *miraculous* gifts of the Apostles; but, if as Bishops, (Bishops being often said to succeed the Apostles as chief pastors in the Church,) it is on the supposition that St. Peter bore the title of one. Therefore, as they do not succeed St. Peter in that sense alone, in which they could be strictly said to be his successors; namely, in that of possessing the qualities of *inspired* Apostles; I conclude that the rule of analogy does not apply. Again, as no

evidence exists, that the title of Bishop was borne by St. Peter; and as Irenæus, on the joint authority of SS. Peter and Paul, testifies, that it was first conferred on *Linus*; it follows, that the Bishops of Rome are the successors of *Linus*, and not of St. Peter. Irenæus's words are, * "The blessed Apostles, (he † subsequently makes express mention of their names) after they had founded and built the Church of Rome, committed the office of Bishop, or the administration of the Episcopacy, (τῆς Ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν,) to *Linus*." This father's authority is decisive on the point, and cannot consistently be objected to by Doctor Milner, after admitting it in a former instance.

Although Doctor Milner does not say expressly *totidem verbis*, that the Church of Rome is the MOTHER and MISTRESS of all other Churches, yet he does so *totidem literis*, by the frequent repetition he makes of its greater antiquity and superiority. These titles, which occur in ‡ one of the heterodoxical articles of

* Θεμελιωσαντες ἦν καὶ οἰκοδομησαντες οἱ μακαριοὶ ἀποστολοὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν Δινῶ τὴν τῆς ἘΠΙΣΚΟΠΗΣ λειτουργίαν ἐνεχίρησαν.—Iren. lib. iii. contra Heræes. c. 3.

† Πίτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.—IBID.

‡ "Viz. I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of Rome to be the *Mother* and *Mistress* of all Churches."

Pope Pius the Fifth's creed, are formally asserted by the Council of Trent, and sworn to by the beneficed Clergy of the Church of Rome. Now, that the Church of Rome is "the *Mother* of all Churches," is manifestly untrue; as appears from *various passages in the Acts of the Apostles, which speak of a Church at Jerusalem so early after our Lord's Ascension as the day of Pentecost. It was, therefore, through this Church, which was the *Mother* of all Churches, and not through that of Rome, that the prophecy of our Saviour was conveyed to Christian churches in general. Besides, it was in the Church of Jerusalem, and not in the Church of Rome, that our Saviour's prophecy respecting the Church being built on St. Peter as on a rock, was fulfilled. As to the Church of Rome being "the *Mistress* of all Churches," it is equally untrue; for, if we look back to the primitive ages, we shall find that the See of Rome had no *universal* supremacy. When it was stated to the first Council of Nice, that Meletius, a Bishop of Egypt, ordained Bishops, without the consent of the metropolitan Bishop of Alexandria; it thus expressed itself in its sixth Canon: † "Let the ancient customs prevail that are in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alex.

* Acts, ii. 4, 14, 41, 47. *IBID.* v. 11. *IB.* viii. 1. *IB.* xv. 4.

† See Bp. of St. David's CHURCHMAN ARMED, vol. ii. p. 161.

andria have the power over them all, *as the Bishop of Rome also hath the like custom.*" A short period before this Council was held, we find Cyprian maintaining a controversy with Stephen, Bishop of Rome, about the baptism of heretics, in which he treated that haughty Prelate with the greatest contempt, and would only allow him a pre-eminence of *order* and *association*; not of *POWER* and *AUTHORITY*. Yet * Doctor Milner ascribes this assertion of his rights to "the *mistake* of Cyprian," in not thinking the Pope's authority superior to general tradition; which is, in fact, conceding the point. But, as if he felt, that he had gone too far, he says, that Cyprian admitted Stephen's authority to a *certain* extent, "by advising the same Pope to depose Marcian, a schismatical Bishop of Gaul, and to appoint another Bishop in his place;" whereas, this only shews, that Cyprian thought that Stephen had power over a Bishop of Gaul, who had derived his mission from Rome. So that the case, *quoad* Marcian's affair, rests, as Doctor Milner's concession left it.

The instances which the Doctor adduces, of Athanasius, Chrysostom, and other Bishops, who had been deposed, being restored to their respective Sees, through the mediation of the Popes, do not in the least degree tend to settle

* LETTER xlv. p. 139.

the question of Supremacy. Because, as often as any of the eastern Bishops were * forced to yield to the stronger party; they sought redress in a quarter where it was readily granted. The Bishop of Rome took them one after the other under his protection, and thus acquired for the Roman See new degrees of influence and power. For, if the appeal of the exiled Bishops to him, was politic and wise, as through his interposition, they obtained in the eastern Emperor, more than a counterbalance to their domestic enemies; it was equally politic and wise in the Pope to espouse their cause, as it tended to raise his consequence and authority in the eyes of the eastern Church, and thus imperceptibly to establish his Supremacy.

Doctor Milner also lays great stress on the authority of the Council of Sardis, which, he says, † “confirmed the Bishop of Rome in the right of receiving appeals from all the Churches in the world.” But, were I to admit this, which I do not, because the authority of that Council is considered dubious, and its laws spurious, by the most eminent writers: still, the plea for assuming a supreme jurisdiction in the universal Church, must be very weak, which only depends on the decree of one obscure Council.

* MOSH. ECCL. HIST. vol. ii. p. 29.

† LETTER xlv. p. 140.

It is true, as Doctor Milner observes, that * Gregory the Great rebuked the pride of John, Patriarch of Constantinople, for “ assuming to himself the title of œcumenical or *universal* Bishop.” Yet, suspicious as were the time and manner of John’s lordly pretensions on this head, the counter-pretensions of Gregory were still more so. But, notwithstanding the ambitious designs of the latter, and the pomp and splendour with which the see of Rome was then surrounded, it was reserved for the succeeding age to see the unprincipled Phocas, after the murder of his master, transfer the title of † *universal* Bishop from the Eastern Patriarch to the Roman Pontiff. After this manner, was this spiritual tyranny, which sprang from a misinterpreted text of Scripture, and with which the pontifical character was first invested by an inhuman monster, introduced and established. From that tyranny we were happily released at the ever-memorable era of the Reformation, and we must always

* Gregory thus writes to the Emperor Maurice about John : —“ *Ego autem fidenter dico, quia quisque se universalem sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione suâ Antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se cæteris præponit.*”—Lib. iv. Ep 30.

† “ The title of Universal Bishop, which had been given by Leo and Justinian to the Patriarchs of C. P. was not attended with *any* accession of power.”—MOSH. ECCL. HIST. Vol. ii. p. 112.

be on our guard against its return. For * “as God has appointed no universal Monarch, neither has he an universal Bishop. And all the arguments, which an universal Bishop could use for unity and peace to end controversies, might be used by an universal Monarch, and both prove fallacious, to the greater disturbance, rather than settlement of that peace.” We should, therefore, dread an *universal* Bishop, as much as an *universal* Monarch; the one being no less an enemy in temporal affairs, to *civil*, than the other is in *spiritual* concerns, to religious, liberty. But, the very thought about such a claim as that of spiritual dominion being set up, is sufficient to excite both our surprise and indignation; for we may rest assured, that when one Church affects a control over another, it will never want the inclination, if it have the power, to exercise its authority.

Towards the conclusion of his letter, Doctor Milner throws off all restraint, and indulges in a virulence of language, not equalled, certainly not surpassed, by Ward, Chaloner, or Gandolph, against the first Protestant Monarchs of this realm, and their successors. “If,” says he, † “they could succeed in proving, that Christ

* LESLIE’S Case stated, vol. i. p. 468. † LETTER xlv. p. 142.

had not built his Church on St. Peter and the Popes, it would still remain for them to prove, that he founded any part of it on Henry VIII., Edward VI., and the Protestant Monarchs who succeeded them." He then institutes a comparison between those Princes, including, of course, our present GRACIOUS KING, and Tiberius, Pilate, and Herod, as to their power over a Christian Church: he even travels farther, as he extends his parallel to the Great Turk and the Lama of Thibet! When I meet with passages even more aspersive than this, of the Royal Guardians of our Church, and find them classed with Simon Magus, Mahomet, Voltaire, and Robespierre, as chief heretics and schismatics of their respective ages; and not only thus classed, but represented on what Doctor Milner calls the APOSTOLICAL TREE, as * branches cast forth, withered, *and fit only to be thrown into the fire.* When I hear him speak of conciliation, and, in the same breath, tell those to be conciliated, that they are *heretics* and *schismatics*; I feel at a loss how to reconcile such language with the principles of reason or common sense.

To the reader who may not have seen his Apostolical Tree, a few words descriptive of

* John, xv. 6.

it, may not be unacceptable. The Tree is supposed to be the vine; the root of it represents CHRIST; while its trunk exhibits the *succession* of the Roman Pontiffs, to the present day. On the parts of the branches immediately attached to the trunk, at each side, are engraved the *nations* which first embraced Christianity; while the fruit, on the more remote parts of each branch, demonstrates the *saints* and *pious personages* of their respective ages. So far, so good: but then come the withered and broken off limbs, which designate the HERETICS and SCHISMATICS; the *greater* ones, such as Simon Magus, Mahomet, HENRY VIII., EDWARD VI., ELIZABETH, as above enumerated, with many others, on the one side; and the *lesser* heretics, such as Ebion, Gotescale, Wickliffe, Luther, and Wesley, &c. &c. on the other.

This specious but unjust representation of Christ's Universal Church, according to which Doctor Milner assumes the main *stem* and *trunk* to be the *Roman* Church, whence the Apostolic juice flowed to *all* other Churches, may be met by the following simple statement, as illustrative of the independence of the different Apostolic Churches from one another. The reader may perceive, that there is more than *one* main conduit conveying the stream of life from the DIVINE FOUNTAIN to the nations of

the earth. The * selection of a few out of many instances will suffice.

THE ROCK,

Thou art Christ, the Son of the Living God.

The first Church founded at—

1. JERUSALEM, by St. JAMES.
2. ROME, by Saints Peter and Paul.
3. BRITAIN, probably by St. Paul.
4. ALEXANDRIA in Egypt, by St. Mark.
5. SYRIA, by St. Thomas.
6. COLOSSE, by Epaphras.
7. CRETE, by Titus.

After this artless representation, I may ask, what becomes of the *exclusive* Apostolicity, &c. of the Church of Rome?

The very nature of the charge which Doctor Milner urges against the principle of the Reformation, defeats itself; when he infers, that because Cranmer's notions respecting the King's

* The authorities by which I have been guided are, Hartmann *de rebus Christianorum*, and Fabricius's *Lux Evangelii*.

Supremacy were at one time unsettled, he therefore *constantly* held, that the Monarch could make Bishops by his proclamation, or even “by the bill of the town-crier.” But what excuse can he offer for repeating the vile fabrication of the Nag’s-head affair? There may be some palliation for Ward’s virulence and falsehoods, when he said, that during the reigns of the first Protestant Monarchs the Church of England had no *Episcopal* Consecration, and that our Bishops were made by *Letters Patent*, because he was then in exile, enduring hardship and want; but there can be no apology for Doctor Milner’s treading in his steps, when in the full enjoyment of the blessings of Toleration, and of all the rights and privileges of a British subject.

As to the *despotic* power, which he alleges Queen Elizabeth to have exercised over the Church, it went no farther than to appoint Bishops to sees, where they were to discharge episcopal functions after they were duly consecrated. That wise Monarch well knew that Letters Patent could not give validity to consecration or ordination; nor invalidate them when they possessed the requisite *essentials*. Farther than this she neither went, nor affected to go. Do we not find, that the Emperors formerly exercised a similar jurisdiction within their dominions, and sometimes extended it to the

appointment of the Popes? Can we forget, that it was the edicts and laws of Constantine in favour of the Christian religion, which caused persecution against its professors to cease, and which established Christianity as the religion of the Empire? Can we either forget what Clovis did in France, or Ethelbert in England? We know that the temporal power has, in every age and in every country, exercised authority over the concerns of the Church; and that it is in consequence of such interference that Kings and Queens have been appropriately called its “nursing fathers and mothers.”

But we shall be told, that the Anathemas of the Council of Trent are mere *bruta fulmina*, and that it is idle at the present day to speak of a controlling power in the Church of Rome over other countries; or that it now claims to be *Mistress* of all Churches. Thanks to the strong arm of the law, and to the wholesome restraints imposed on Popery, that those denunciations are inoperative. Yet if our lives be not at stake, the truth of the Gospel is, and consequently, the PROTESTANT RELIGION. But that the principle continues, and that the claim for exercising spiritual jurisdiction over those, who have withdrawn from its communion, is upheld as vigorously as ever, is beyond all controversy. It is so declared in the Trent catechism, which

has always been a standard for doctrine in the Popish Church, that *heretics* and *schismatics*, who have abandoned the Church, are still in its *power*, * “as persons liable to be called by it to judgment, *punished*, and *doomed by anathema to damnation*.” And it is further taught in the theological lectures in Maynooth, that the Church, viz. that of Rome, † “retains its jurisdiction over all apostates, heretics, and schismatics, although they may *not belong* to its body.” When with this is connected the doctrine of *exclusive* salvation, and the dogma, that the Romish Church is *exclusively* HOLY, CATHOLIC, and APOSTOLIC; and when the thousand expedients are considered, (witness Doctor Milner’s ingenious delineation of the Apostolical Tree,) which are artfully contrived by the Popish clergy to make their laity think as they themselves do;—I must candidly express my apprehensions about the fate of our Protestant Church in this part of the United Kingdom, should unqualified political power be put into the hands of men, who conscientiously

* “Heretici vero et schismatici, qui ab Ecclesiâ *desciverunt* non negandum tamen quin in Ecclesiæ *potestate* sint, ut qui ab eâ in iudicium vocentur, *puniantur*, et *anathemate damnentur*.”—CATECH. ROM. p. 78. Ed. 1587.

† “Ecclesia suam retinet jurisdictionem in omnes *Apostatas*, *Hereticos*, et *Schismaticos*, quanquam ad illud corpus *nou jam* *pertineant*.”—DE LA HOGUE de Eccl. Christi, p. 394.

believe it to be involved in heresy and schism, and consequently an object of divine vengeance. If the Church of Rome be resolved to uphold a title, to which it has no just claim, and if conformably with its pretensions of being *Mother* and *Mistress* of all other Churches, it claims a *spiritual* jurisdiction over their members as *deserters* from itself;—our Legislature will, I trust, in their wisdom guard us against the recurrence of those evils, which the exercise of spiritual power has so often produced in this country, should they carry into effect their present intentions respecting the Roman Catholic Body.

We have already seen that the Church of Jerusalem, and not the Church of Rome, is the *Mother* of all particular Churches, that is, of the Church Universal: and as it might claim to be *Mistress* of all Churches, on the very same principle as that set up for the supremacy of the Roman Church, it incontrovertibly follows, that the Pope is not the Head or Governor of Christ's Church universal. Besides, it was laid down by the first Councils of Nice and Ephesus, that every metropolitanical Church was independent from the other. The ancient British and Irish Churches too, were * independent, as appears from their observance

* See BR. OF ST. DAVID'S Second Letter to his clergy on

of Easter being different from that kept up in the Church of Rome; while they agreed with the Oriental Churches in this particular, no less than in their † rejection of the Papal Supremacy. It is unnecessary to add, how the intruder's conduct is viewed at the present day by our own national Church.

Thus is the Supremacy of the Pope discarded by every authority, ancient and modern. I have also proved that it is antisciptural;—that it is not borne out by any thing, which St. Peter says of himself;—nor by any thing, which St. Paul says of him;—nor by any superior respect

this subject. BLACKSTONE says, “ that the ancient British Church was a *stranger* to the Bishop of Rome, and all her pretended authority.”—Vol. iv. p. 105. ABP. USHER proves to conviction, that “ the Pope had *no* jurisdiction, spiritual or temporal, in Ireland, before the twelfth century.”—*Discourse*, &c. c. viii. p. 74.

† BP. JEWELL, speaking of the Eastern Patriarchs, says that they will not, “ in *any* wise, yield to his authority, nor give *any* manner of honour or reverence to his person, no more than to Mahomet.”—*Defence* of his Apol. p. 714. DR. BUCHANAN shews, that the same feeling exists among the present race of Christians in India. “ Whence do you derive your ordination?” said the chaplains of the Syrian Bishop to him: “ From Rome. You derive it from a Church, which is our ancient enemy, and with which we *never* would unite.”—*Christian Researches*, p. 131. MR. L. FOSTER gives farther confirmation to this account, as he has “ heard more than one Greek Prelate pronounce the Pope to be nearly as great a deceiver as Mahomet himself.”—*Speech* on the R. C. Quest. 1813. p. 32.

shewn Saint Peter on the part of the other Apostles ;—nor by any of the recorded occurrences of St. Peter's life ;—nor by any special authority delegated to him by our SAVIOUR.

CHAPTER XVI.

TOLERATION.

DOCTOR MILNER has devoted the longest Letter in his *END OF CONTROVERSY*, to the subject of religious persecution, and appears to treat of it with more than ordinary satisfaction. Fires, stakes, faggots, axes, knives, halters, gibbets, racks, and tortures, meet the eye in every page. The reformed Churches on the Continent, and the Protestant Princes of the English Reformation, with those highest under their authority, *alone* applied those instruments of death, impelled by the fiery spirit of persecution, and an unmitigated rancour against the *unoffending* members of the Church of Rome: while he never once glances at the intolerance of Charles IX. and Lewis XIV., or the bloody tribunal of the Duke of Alva! When speaking of Queen Elizabeth, he details with circumstantial minuteness, the cruelties she inflicted * “on two hundred (Roman) Catholics, whom she got hanged, drawn, and quartered, for the mere *exercise* of the religion of their ancestors:”—

* LETTER xlix. p. 151.

although he is conscious that those persons suffered, not because of their *belief* in Popish doctrines, but because their zeal to restore Popery led them to rebel against her government. But, if he speaks of Queen Mary and her partisans, it is for the purpose of palliating the *faults* into which their anxiety about the welfare of Christ's Church on earth betrayed them! Over the disgusting subject, which relates to their times, I willingly draw a veil, while I ardently wish, that so much of this narrative of human infirmity and wickedness, as Doctor Milner has detailed, was struck out of the page of history; or, at least, that it should never re-appear in print. As we have escaped the storm of persecution, and have not witnessed the tremendous trials to which those, who went before us, were exposed; we should rather cultivate the feelings of mutual charity and forbearance, than exasperate each other by charge and recrimination. Let Doctor Milner speak, not of what was, but what *is*; the state of the Roman Catholics of the British Empire; and instead of dwelling as he does, on irritating topics, let him rather bespeak their friendly affections on the part of the British Constitution, and laud it for the blessings which they now enjoy under it. This is what would become a good subject, and a good Christian.

There are two points, and two only, in Doc-

tor Milner's letter on Persecution, to which I shall advert. The one respects what he calls the "*unintelligible* DECLARATION against Popery," and the other, the "*impracticable* TEST ACT;" by both of which, he says, the exclusion of Roman Catholics from political power is effected.

He affirms, that we rigidly adhere to the Declaration against Popery, under the *groundless pretext* of its being necessary for the support of the established Church, although it be undeniable, * "that that Church flourished more before, than after the passing of that law." If we only consider the † precise period, at which that statute was called into existence, we shall have reason to admire the wisdom and policy of its enactment. Indeed, were it not for the impregnable barrier, which it reared at that time, in defence of our established Church, we should not now have a Church to defend. Every day's ‡ experience proves, that neither the tone, nor the temper of the Church of Rome towards heretics and schismatics, are different

* LETTER xlix. p. 167. † 30 Charles II.

‡ The resistance given by Doctors Milner, Coppinger, and Murphy, Friar Hayes, Mr. O'Connell, and other zealots, to the intercourse with Rome Bill, demonstrates the increased necessity of not exposing the Established Church to the *mild persuasions*, which those liberal characters would employ in its overthrow.

now from what they were in the sixteenth century ; witness, the deliberate and published sentiments of Gregory Martin, Ward, Chaloner, Walmsley, Plowden, Gandolphy, and though last, not the least violent, of Doctor Milner himself, respecting the Church of England. Do not those writers consider our Church *heretical* and *schismatical* ; our authorized version of the Bible *notoriously* * corrupt and erroneous ; our form of Consecration and Ordination *null* ; the acts of our Ministry *invalid*, and ourselves doomed to *inevitable* damnation ? May I not add, that the present Pope himself reprobates † “ intermarriages with heretics as *sacrilegious*, *criminal*, and *odious*,” and points out, in language not to be mistaken, those meant by this opprobrious title ? Yet, with these facts staring us in the face, are we told, that we continue the De-

* See the LETTER of the present Pope, as published in the Dublin Journal of October 18, 1820.

† When the Pope pronounces an union of Roman Catholics with heretics detestable, he does so in consequence of an abhorrence of all connexion with the Church to which they belong. “ Les mêmes lois,” says he, “ qui l’ont porté à défendre aux chrétiens de se marier avec les infidèles, l’ont aussi déterminé à prohiber les noces sacrilèges des Catholiques avec les hérétiques. Aussi nous devons être amèrement affligés . . . de trouver des Catholiques épris d’une passion si criminelle, que de ne pas avoir en horreur, et de ne pas se faire un devoir de s’abstenir de ces détestables unions.”—RELATION de ce qui s’est passé à Rome, vol. ii. p. 109.

claration against Popery under a *groundless* pretext.

As the die is not yet cast, which is to unsettle the existing order of things, I would respectfully entreat those distinguished advocates for Popish aggrandizement, who have joined Doctor Milner in denouncing the Parliamentary Declaration against Popery as unnecessarily severe and insulting; to consider, that every argument which can be urged against it, bears with greater force against the very formularies of our Church. Thus, if it be compared with our *twenty-second* and *twenty-eighth* ARTICLES, which pronounce the doctrines, of which they speak, superstitious and false, and as being “repugnant to the Word of God;” or, with the HOMILY which teaches, that the Invocation of Saints is gross Idolatry, “as well *inwardly* as outwardly, like that of the Gentiles;” or, with the RUBRIC annexed to the Communion Service, which declares the doctrine of Transubstantiation to be false, and the worship of the Sacramental bread and wine, idolatrous, and *to be abhorred of all faithful Christians*; or, with the general language of our Church, which speaks of the *arrogance* and *impiety* of the Church of Rome, no less than of her *blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits*: we shall find, that the obnoxious statute is couched in language less forcible, and less significant of the abominations of Popery, than

that used in those formularies. Unless, therefore, our Legislators be prepared to new-model them, I see not how they can consistently cancel this salutary enactment.

We come now to the second point—the exclusion of Roman Catholics from political power, which Doctor Milner says, is enforced under another *groundless pretext* (viz. the TEST ACT) of being essential to the support of the Established Church. He sets out with assuming, that exclusion from power and religious persecution, are one and the same thing. But no two things are more opposite in their nature. For, * persecution is positive; while exclusion from power is negative in its effects. Persecution interferes with personal liberty, on speculative grounds; while exclusion from power is consistent with Toleration in the most extensive sense of the word. Persecution is the offspring of intolerance; while exclusion from power is the dictate of nature's first law, that of self-protection. Thus it is, that Doctor Milner confounds things which are totally distinct. It is thus, that Popish writers have always confounded them, in their earnestness to remove those Tests, which have been enacted for the stability and permanence of the Established Church.

I can readily conceive why Doctor Milner

* See Preface.

pays such deference to Hume's opinion respecting those statutes which are so obnoxious to him. Prejudiced as that writer was in favour of the House of Stuart, and indifferent to every principle of religion; it was natural to expect, that he would represent them as our greatest national disgrace. But it is beyond my conjecture, how he could bring himself to do Swift such palpable injustice, as to make him appear favourable to emancipation, in the *Popish* sense of the word, and to ascribe to him language, which, *if* he ever used it, was spoken for a purpose different from that to which it is applied.

Doctor Milner makes Swift to say, * “that an incapacity by law for any man to be made a judge, or a colonel, merely on a point of conscience, is a negative discouragement, and consequently a real persecution.” Now, there were only two parties, viz. the Presbyterian and the Popish, in favour of one or other of which, Dean Swift could have thus expressed himself. These we shall examine separately, and, therefore, first begin with the case of the Presbyterians.

That he was hostile to the attempts made in Ireland, to take off the Test, as a kind of pre-

* Doctor Milner's reference is to vol. viii. p. 56, of Swift's Works, where no such words as those attributed to that author are to be found, at least not in Nichols's, or Scott's editions.

paratory step, to make it palatable in England, may be collected from his tract entitled the Presbyterian's PLEA OF MERIT. In this he observes, that, * “if once their light (viz. that of the Presbyterians) would so shine, the Papists, delighted with *the blaze*, would all come in and *dance about it*.” Again, when he speaks of the great objection of the Presbyterians, about making the blessed Sacrament a kind of Test, before admittance into any employment; (although, by the way, he believes, that † “they would scruple it as little as a *long* grace before and after a *good* dinner, which they can say without *bending* a knee:”) yet he proposes, that “before the repeal of the Test Act, one *equivalent* to it may be substituted, and that no man shall receive any employment before he swears himself *a true member of the Church of Ireland*, in doctrine and discipline.” And, lastly, “that if the gate be thrown wide open, without any Test at all,” to those who profess “an utter hatred to kingly government,” the consequence may be easily foreseen. It is hence evident, that Dean Swift did not use the words ascribed to him by Doctor Milner, in favour of the Presbyterians; or that, if he did, it must have been in his usual ironical style.

* SWIFT'S Works, Nichols's edit. vol. viii. p. 375.

† *IBID.* pp. 394, 395.

But that he had neither Popery, nor its professors at heart, can also be abundantly proved from his writings.

As to Popery in general, which has * “for a thousand years past been introducing and multiplying corruptions both in doctrine and discipline,” he remarks, “I look upon it as the *most absurd* system of Christianity professed by any nation and that, if it had been thought fit to abate of the law’s rigour against Popery in this kingdom, it was done for very wise reasons.” In another place, he speaks of the wisdom of keeping Popery in check, and “*thanked God*, that it was daily growing less and less by the *just* severity of the laws, and the *utter aversion* of our people from that *idolatrous superstition*.” And again, he expresses his belief, † “that Presbytery is not above *one third as bad* as Popery that there is no doubt, that Presbytery and a commonwealth are *less formidable* evils than Popery, slavery, and the Pretender; for, if the fanatics were in power, he should be in more apprehension of being starved, than burned.” But it is unnecessary to trouble the reader with further proof of Swift’s feelings being, not only not favourable, but directly hostile to any the least encouragement being extended to Popery. Indeed, were

* *Ibid.* pp. 388, 389.

† *Ibid.* vol. v. pp. 88, 89.

he now alive, and to get the credit of language at such variance with his real sentiments, as that attributed to him by Doctor Milner, he would, with his usual point, observe, as he did on a similar occasion, when he was set down as friendly to the repeal of the sacramental Test; * “that it was his misfortune to be *treated like a sober man with a drunken face, to have the SCANDAL of the vice without the satisfaction!*”

* ISID. vol. x. p. 76.

CHAPTER XVII.

POPISH, OR FALSE MIRACLES.

IT is painful to think, that in the present enlightened age, a gentleman like Doctor Milner, who displays learning in almost every department of science ; who possesses experience, intelligence, and taste ; who writes well, and reasons acutely—should be so besotted, as not only to believe himself, but to attempt to induce others to believe, all the stupid legends of the dark ages, and the modern fabrications of the same stamp. Such fatuity would be a miracle in itself, were it not known how superstition debases the reason, when it has gained the ascendant over the mind.

In the letter, which he has devoted to the subject of Miracles, he argues, * “ that if the Roman *Catholic* Church were not the *only* true Church, God would not have given any attestation in its favour.” Thus he derives a new proof from false Miracles, of the Church of Rome being the only true Church. For, when once a strong faith admits the reality of those

* Letter xxiii. p. 72. See also his LETTERS to a Prebendary ; INQUIRY into certain opinions, &c. &c.

Miracles, it concludes at once, that as none but members of the Church of Rome can perform them, that Church must be the *only* true Church. “Having demonstrated the distinctive,” by which he means the exclusive holiness of the Roman Catholic Church, he professes himself * “prepared to shew, that God has borne testimony to that holiness, by the many and incontestable Miracles he has wrought in her favour, from the age of the Apostles down to the present time.” These incontestable miracles, he afterwards states to be *cures* of a miraculous nature, performed on different persons; as if such cures could be admitted as evidence of the truth of doctrines entertained by the persons relieved; inasmuch as they are not confined to the Romish Church, but are found in communions directly opposed to each other.

Our blessed Lord did not confine the power of working Miracles to himself, or to his own time. If he promised this power to his Apostles, he confirmed his promise in their respective persons. It is no where said in Scripture, that a miraculous event should not take place out of the true Church; and if it be not, then it follows, that such an event cannot be regarded as a proof of the truth of any particular Church. This † St. Paul determines to be the case; for

* *IBID.*

† 2 THESS. ii. 7.

when speaking of the "*Mystery of Iniquity*," he says, that his * "coming would be after the working of Satan, with *all* powers and *signs*, and *lying wonders*." In fact, Doctor Milner himself seems to be reserved in putting in too great a claim to supernatural agency in favour of the Church of Rome; when he admits that it "never possessed miraculous powers, so as to be able to effect cures, or other supernatural events at her *mere pleasure*." When the zeal is so great as to discover a miracle in every extraordinary event, for the purpose of strengthening the feeble arguments put forward in favour of the exclusive sanctity of the Romish Church, the number of miracles said to exist cannot excite surprise; and when those only, who are interested in pronouncing such events miraculous, are present during their performance; it cannot much promote Doctor Milner's views, were all the miracles reported to have been wrought since the age of the Apostles, conceded to his Church, since the advantage to be derived from the concession is only such as any other Church would disdainfully reject.

He begins with what Ignatius relates about the wild beasts, which were let loose upon the martyrs, being frequently restrained by a divine power from hurting them. On this head, a

* *Ibid.* ii. 9.

single observation will suffice. This Father's words are, "*ne sicut in aliis, territæ sint et non eos tetigerunt*," and imply, that the fierce animals did not behave as in ordinary cases, but that being terrified at the sight of the surrounding spectators, they refused to fight. Ignatius considered the occurrence purely accidental and natural; otherwise, he would have given the glory to God, and have besought him not to repress their fury. And as to the * Miracle which deterred the Apostate Julian from rebuilding the Temple of Jerusalem, it must of necessity have occurred; or the † prophecy which related to it could not be fulfilled. In its exact completion, I perfectly agree with Doctor Milner, and for the very reason assigned by Gibbon himself; that if it were not verified, ‡ "the Imperial sophist would have converted the success of his undertaking into a specious (he should have said *solid*,) argument, against the faith of prophecy, and the truth of Revelation." But, I am not equally disposed to admit, that there were other as extraordinary miracles, beside the one mentioned, since the Apostolic age; or if there were, that they were performed for the purpose alleged by him.

* Marcellinus, a contemporary of Julian, attests the fact of fiery eruptions and other convulsions of nature taking place, when the Apostate attempted to rebuild Jerusalem.

† DANIEL, ix. 27.

‡ DECLINE AND FALL, vol. iv. p. 104.

The miracle to which he alludes, as having taken place at Tipasa in Africa, consisted in this, that those Christians, whose tongues were cut out by order of the Arian Hunneric, in the fifth century, were enabled to speak as distinctly as they did *before* this barbarous operation was performed. It is true, as the Doctor says, that some learned Protestants, as Abbadie and Dodwell have admitted this miracle; but he is far from correct, when he sets down Mosheim as its advocate. This correct writer states the circumstances as transmitted to him by Procopius and others; but his own opinion, he thus expresses: * “whether it is to be attributed to a supernatural and miraculous power is a matter *not so easily* decided, and which admits of *much dispute*.” His able Translator, likewise, after presenting his reader with a clear and concise view of the arguments advanced for and against the miracle by DODWELL and TOLL, seems to feel the *same* doubts, which Mosheim did, about its existence. According to him, Dodwell considered the occasion of sufficient importance to require the divine interposition; while Toll maintained, that as it was not wrought to convert infidels to Christianity, but apparently for the purpose of making proselytes from Arianism to the Athanasian faith, the di-

* MOSH. ECCL. HIST. vol. ii. p. 63.

vine interposition was not necessary. Between these conflicting opinions, Maclaine takes a middle course, neither denying the power of God on the one hand, nor, on the other, admitting the necessity of its exercise. He observes, that the case of the two who *remained dumb*, (of whom it should be remarked, Doctor Milner makes no mention) “furnishes a shrewd presumption, that all did not *equally* undergo the same operation.” When I say, I admit the full force of this observation, I wish to be understood, not as arguing against the *possibility* of such a miracle having occurred; God forbid! but the probability, against which I see such strong objections to exist. But, were I to acknowledge the miracle to the fullest extent of Doctor Milner’s wishes, I conceive that my admission would be more prejudicial, than serviceable to his cause; since the Church, in whose favour the miracle is reported to have been performed, is rather to be considered the prototype of the Church of England, than that of the Church of Rome.

I should not omit to mention, that the sceptical Gibbon relates the accounts transmitted to us of the miracle in question by the forementioned historians, with circumstantial accuracy; but, in such a way, and with such a sneer against the Christians, that Doctor Milner cannot, in the next Edition of his Book, consist-

ently refer to the authorities, to which his attention has, in the present instance, been directed by this fascinating, but prejudiced writer.

There still remain two of the many remarkable instances of supernatural agency spoken of by Doctor Milner, to which I shall now advert. The one relates to St. Augustine, "the Apostle to England," in the sixth, and the other to St. Xavier, the Popish missionary to the Indies, in the sixteenth, century. The question, which relates to the planting and propagation of Christianity in England before Augustine's mission into that country, and the independence of the British Church from that of Rome, is happily set at rest by the learned labours of the Bishop of St. David's, and the Rev. Doctor Hales. On this point, therefore, it is unnecessary for me to enlarge; but I would ask Dr. Milner, whether the miracle of restoring sight to the blind, (which, on the authority of Bede, he alleges Augustine to have wrought) convinced the British Bishops; or, whether they did in consequence admit the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome? We know that they did not; and that they equally resisted the threats and promises of his missionary.

As to Xavier; it might have been expected that the Doctor would have been more reserved in ascribing miraculous powers to one, who lived so much nearer our own times, than to those

of more distant ages : because, the means of detecting imposture is more within our reach in the former, than in the latter case ; and because, if it be found, that recourse has been had to fabrication with respect to accounts of modern date, it sinks into disrepute those of earlier origin.

Of Xavier's miracles, which, Doctor Milner says, * “ consisted in foretelling future events, speaking unknown languages, calming tempests at sea, and *raising the dead to life* ;” † Acosta, a contemporary writer, a Jesuit, and a Missionary also, makes no mention. But had those singular occurrences taken place, he must have noticed them. And, with respect to the gift of tongues, which is ascribed to him in a supernatural degree, it is certain that he himself deeply lamented in one of his letters, *his deficiency* in this very particular ! Now, where he wanted a requisite which would have been so essential to the cause of proselytism among the pagans ; it is highly improbable that his saintship should have been vested with any other. Indeed, his simple acknowledgment on this one point throws discredit on the other marvellous stories told of him. But Doctor Milner adds, that Xavier's miracles “ were *verified* soon after the saint's death by virtue of a commission from John III. King of Portugal.” Here again, the silence of

* LETTER xxiii. p. 81. † *De Procurandâ Indorum salute.*

Acosta about those alleged miracles meets him; and not only this, but the express assertion of this writer, that *no* miracles whatever were performed in India. And, as Acosta's account was not published for nearly forty years after Xavier's death, it is evident that that space of time at least elapsed, before his miracles were thought of. This is * Bishop Douglas's opinion on the subject; and although Doctor Milner attempts to invalidate it by a reference to Acosta's work, yet the very † place referred to establishes its correctness. That writer barely says, "that *great signs* were reported of Xavier by numerous and credible witnesses." But Dr. M. goes farther, since he says, that they not only "vie in

* See CRITERION of Miracles, p. 84. Doctor Buchanan tells of his having observed to the Archbishop of Goa "that Xavier was an eminently great man; but that what others have written *for him* and *of him* tarnished his fame, by making him the inventor of fables. To which the chief Inquisitor candidly signified *his assent*." See *Christian Researches*, p. 162. This anecdote is the more valuable, both as it records the admission of a Popish ecclesiastic of high rank, resident on the very theatre of Xavier's ministry, and consequently acquainted with every act of his; and as it exhibits the hollow pretensions set up for this saint by Doctor Milner, on the score of miraculous agency.

† "quod miraculorum *nulla* facultas sit, quæ Apostoli plurima perpetrârunt."—*De Procur.*, &c. L. ii. c. S. Here Acosta *denies* that the missionaries had *ANY* power; but Doctor M.'s gloss is, "that they only had not the *same facility* as the Apostles." FACULTAS—*facility*, secundum Milner!—See LETTER XXIV. p. 99.

number, splendour, and publicity with the miracles of St. Bernard;" but appear to equal those of our Saviour Himself!!

I must necessarily pass over the claims to supernatural agency, put forward for St. Francis of Sales, and others, whose performances, Doctor Milner tells us, extended even to the resurrection of the dead; because they rest, at best, but on doubtful authority, and are not acknowledged by some of the most eminent writers of the Popish communion! But the miracles of recent date, with which "God has illustrated the (Roman) Catholic Church," are beyond all *suspicion*; inasmuch as those which Doctor Milner did not witness himself, have "had the most respectable attestation" to their genuineness! Those, which he specifies are the cures of Joseph Lamb, "who *conceived* that the spine of his back was broken;" of Mary Wood, who had received "a desperate wound in her hand;" and of Winifred White, whose disease was "a curvature of the spine, which produced a hemiplegia, or palsy." The circumstances attendant on the recovery of those persons are detailed with such laboured minuteness, and are in themselves so marvelously ridiculous, that I should dismiss the subject as beneath serious notice, were it not for the importance attached to it by Doctor Milner.

Whether we consider a miracle to be * a suspension of the laws of nature, or † an effect above human power to produce, in attestation of some truth; or ‡ an extraordinary work, in which the interposition of a supernatural power is indisputable; we shall not find the cases reported by Doctor Milner as coming under any one of those definitions. In them, we can perceive no alteration in the course of nature; no effect above human means to accomplish; and no evidence of a divine agency: we can trace them all to their natural causes. With respect to *Joseph Lamb*, whom Doctor Milner reports, from actual knowledge, to have derived relief from the application of § “*a dead man’s hand*”

* LOCKE. † BENTLEY. ‡ BISHOP DOUGLAS.

§ The wonderful cures reported by Doctor Milner to have been wrought by the hand of Father Arrowsmith, find a parallel in those performed by the *hands and arms* of Oswald, as recorded by William of Malmsbury. This historian (see SHARP’S Transl. p. 53. London edit. 1816.) says, “that those precious relics remain, according to the testimony of Bede, through the power of God, without corruption.” It must be observed, that Bede flourished within less than one century of Oswald’s reign, and *four centuries* before William of Malmsbury lived. So that, taking for granted, that Bede’s account of Oswald’s hands, &c. being *without corruption* at the time he wrote, is correct; still, the miracle of their preservation is inferior to that related by Doctor Milner (LETTER xxiii. p. 86.) respecting Arrowsmith’s hand, which is “preserved to this day *entire* at Wigan.” after a lapse of nearly two centuries!

(that of priest Arrowsmith) to his diseased back; what more can be said, than that his imagination had been so powerfully worked upon, and so strongly excited, as to bring him relief? To this circumstance his cure is to be attributed; there being no evidence by revelation, that it was brought about through divine interposition, and, in the absence of such evidence, we cannot go beyond bare conjecture, that his cure was miraculous, were we even disposed to think it so. The power of imagination, in the cure of agues, and of the evil by the Royal touch, is known to be most astonishing. The * fear of becoming a prisoner to Marshal Turenne, suddenly cured an Austrian general, who was crippled from the gout; and Young, the tourist, mentions, that the terror of falling into the sea, or of being devoured by birds of prey, changed the † colour of a per-

* MEAD, in his *Medica Sacra*, p. 70, says, *subitus terror multos interemit*.

† The occurrence took place in the county of Clare, where a lad descended an eyry, which overhung the sea. The rope by which he was held becoming entangled, caused him to despair of safety; and before it was disengaged, the extraordinary change spoken of took place.

Should I omit to mention the surprising effects of Haygarth's metallic tractors on rheumatic affections, or the no less surprising cures performed by the once noted Maineduc, of Cork? This person had wound up public credulity to such a pitch, that the patient, who submitted to his *treatment*, as he called it,

son's hair from black to white, within the few minutes, during which he reckoned on death as inevitable. Here are instances, not merely of the power of the imagination, but of the violence of the passions, producing wonderful effects on the human frame. Can we, therefore, be at a loss, to what the supposed miraculous cure of Joseph Lamb is to be attributed?

As to the cures of Mary Wood and Winifred White, which Doctor Milner sets down as miraculous, we shall find, that they were produced by the regular operations of nature; and where we can do so, reason points out to us this general rule, that we should never ascribe any event to miraculous interposition.

Of the former, he says, * “that being unable to use her hand, she had recourse to God, through the intercession of St. Winifred, by prayers for *nine* days; that she put a piece of *moss*, from the Saint's well, on her wounded arm, continuing *recollected* and praying; when, to her great surprise, the next morning, she found herself *perfectly cured*.” Of the latter, † he

has, when placed by him in a certain position, from no other assignable cause than the mere force of imagination and an ardent faith in the powers of the operator, derived the sought-for relief. The delusion seems to originate in this circumstance, that where there exists a predisposition to believe, no imposture will be too gross to be swallowed.

* LETTER XXIII. p. 88.

† *IBID.* p. 89.

remarks, “that her disease was a curvature of the spine; that this produced a palsy on one side, so that she could feebly crawl, and that having performed certain acts of devotion, and having bathed in the fountain, she, *in one instant of time*, on the 28th of June, 1805, found herself freed from all her pains and disabilities, and was enabled to carry a greater weight on the arm which was diseased, than on the other!”

In the first place, then, the waters of * St. Winifred’s well in Flintshire, to which Doctor Milner alludes, have been discovered to possess medicinal properties of the highest degree. “Their green and sweet scented *moss*,” says † Doctor Linden, “is frequently applied to *ulcerated wounds*, with signal success.” This he ascribes to “a vegetating spirit in the water, which is clear of all gross earth and mineral contents.” Hence, we may perceive, that had that physician lived to see the cure of Mary Wood’s arm, he would have said, that the application of the moss to the wound was attended

* The author of COLUMBANUS *denies* the existence of such a Saint as *St. Winifred*, and observes, “that the monks of Holywell applied in 1380 to *Gilbert de Stone*, to write the Life of *St. Winifred*. Stone asked for materials, which could not be procured. No matter, said he, I shall compose her life *without materials*!”—See LETTER iii. p. 79, and Warton’s Hist. of Eng. Poetry, vol. ii. for a further account of this imaginary saint.

† Linden on Chalybeate Waters, Lond. 1748, p. 126.

with *signal success*, but would never have pronounced the cure itself miraculous.

Again, when Doctor Linden speaks of those waters being “a most powerful cold bath of the first rank, having in their favour a variety of authentic cures, worked upon the most stubborn and malignant diseases ; such as leprosy, *weakness of nerves*, &c. &c.” does he not enable us to account for the recovery of Winifred White also on natural principles? In her case, we see every thing proceed according to the established laws of nature. We see a *relaxed* frame relieved, and finally cured by an immersion in cold water ; whence, we may reasonably ascribe the recovery of the patient, (which Doctor Milner says, was effected in one instant of time, that is, *miraculously*) to the suddenness and violence of the shock on her frame. He remarks, it is true, that the physicians gave “no hope of a perfect cure” in either case. But will it be said, because the diseases baffled their skill, that they were, therefore, beyond remedy? If so, the argument will stand thus. The diseases were incurable, but they were *instantaneously* removed ; therefore, the cures were *supernatural* ! Or, to put the argument in another form, the cure was deemed impossible ; but it was effected “*in one instant of time* ;” therefore, it was *miraculous*. Again, “Winifred White had recourse

to God, through St. Winifred by a * Novena ;” but she had a strong faith in the Saint’s intercession ; therefore, St. Winifred effected her cure ! He must be an expert logician, that could discover the connexion between the conclusion and the premises. Such is Doctor Milner’s reasoning on the point, which if it be not the most logical, will, at least, be allowed the merit of novelty.

But, further, Doctor Milner seems to have forgotten, in 1819, what he admitted in 1805, when he published his observations on Winifred White’s cure ; namely, that she remained *a fortnight* at Holywell, to bathe by *the advice* of her friends. This single circumstance throws discredit on the reputed miracle ; inasmuch as it shews their *apprehensions* of a relapse, which they would not have entertained, were they satisfied of her perfect restoration to health. We may besides collect from Doctor Milner’s account, that she was grossly superstitious ; when he speaks of her setting out for Holywell, † “ with an humble confidence, that God was both *able* and *willing* to work a miracle in her behalf.” On her arrival there, we perceive her mind, which was prepared for this event, enlivened to the

* Certain prayers continued during *nine* days. See DOCTOR MILNER’S Authentic Documents relative to the cure of W. White, of Wolverhampton, &c. p. 34.

† *IBID.*

greatest degree. She goes through her stated rounds of devotion. She sees, or thinks she sees, her malady all but removed. As those, who associate spectres with darkness, are said never to be disappointed in their appearance; so it is with such as look for a miracle. We can easily conceive, therefore, what her imagination, excited as it was by superstition, cherished by ignorance, and stimulated by her spiritual directors, was capable of effecting on her enfeebled frame.

And lastly, when Doctor Milner confidently declares, that Winifred White's cure is supernatural, his decision is grounded on the strength and accuracy of *his own* judgment, in opposition to an Injunction of the Council of Trent, which desires, * “that Bishops *shall not* decide without calling a Council of the Clergy to determine, whether the supposed miracles might not be the effect of *natural* causes.” This collision between his *dictum*, and the rule prescribed by the Council, I merely allude to, for the purpose of shewing how authoritatively he pronounces an opinion, to which the members of his own Communion are in no respect bound to defer.

We may further observe, that both Mary Wood and W. White, were persons of lively

* SESS. XXV. De Invoc. SS.

imaginations, and had wrought themselves into a firm persuasion, that by praying to the tutelary Saint of the Well, their diseases would be removed; and moreover, that their prayers had consequently excited in them a degree of enthusiasm. When, therefore, we connect with those circumstances the medicinal qualities of the waters, we should not be surprised; that nature should be restored to its proper tone. The story of Madame de la Fosse's recovery, as told by Bishop Douglas, strongly resembles those related by Doctor Milner. Being a person of a warm, fanciful temper, her prayers produced in her, says the Bishop, * "such phrenzy as that of a lunatic, or the wildness of a drunkard, so as to cause such a contraction of her blood-vessels, as led to her cure." He further adds, that "the accelerated motions communicated to the nervous system by surprise and joy have removed the most obstinate maladies." As therefore, there can be no reason for doubting, that those excited in Doctor Milner's patients by the warmth of their devotion, might not, with other co-operating causes, such as the application of the moss, and the use of the cold bath, produce their respective cures also; we can feel no hesitation in pronouncing what he attempts to palm on the public as "evi-

* CRITERION of Miracles, p. 232.

dent miracles;" to be, at best, but surprising cures, brought about by *natural* causes.

The miraculous restoration of speech to a person at Killesandra, in the Diocese of Kilmore, through the agency of his parish Priest, is so worthy of being associated with Doctor Milner's miracles, that I cannot forbear calling the reader's attention to it. While we admire the address of the impostor, in duping his superstitious neighbours, and of the Priest, who affected to exercise a supernatural power on the occasion; we cannot but applaud the talent, with which the cheat and the artifices of its contrivers have been exposed. The *modus operandi* adopted by the Priest is not a little curious. He first * "read some prayers over the dumb man, and next gave him holy water to sup *three* times; on swallowing which, he found something *stirring in his stomach*, which ascended by his throat, (*risum teneatis?*) and he *instantly* spoke!!" It is scarcely necessary to add, that the man evinced his gratitude to his benefactor by ceasing to be a *heretic*, and adopting the creed of his Popish wife.

Doctor Milner may, if he please, add to this

* See INQUIRY into the reported miraculous cure of Matthew Breslin, by the REV. JOHN COUSINS, Curate to the Rev. Doctor Hales, with the affidavits of credible witnesses annexed, that Breslin spoke within the five days, during which, it was said, he had lost the faculty of speech.

his other divine attestations in favour of the *exclusive* holiness of the Church of Rome; but let him recollect, that by giving currency to this and similar delusions, he does a greater injury to the Irish people, than any they sustain by the want of education; because, he obstructs, to the degree his influence extends, the growth of vital piety and religion, and contributes to perpetuate among them ignorance, superstition, and error.

CHAPTER XVIII.

PRAYERS IN AN UNKNOWN TONGUE.

NOTWITHSTANDING the express opinion which *St Paul has pronounced in condemnation of the practice of praying in an unknown tongue, and at a time too, when, in consequence of the miraculous gift of tongues, men prayed in strange languages by inspiration; Doctor Milner alleges *his* authority for this very practice in the Church of Rome; for, that he addressed an Epistle, which forms part of the liturgy of all Christian churches, to the Romans, †“in the *Greek* language, although they themselves made use of the Latin.” As it appears to me, there is no analogy whatever between the two cases; between St. Paul’s addressing a Church in a language generally known at that time, and the Clergy of that Church, after a lapse of many centuries, praying in a language not to the edification of the people. But besides, his argument proves too much; for, if the Epistle to the Romans justify the use of a strange tongue in the Roman Catholic Church at the

* 1 Cor. xiv.

† LETTER xlvii. p. 149.

present day, it would follow, that the service intended for the use of that Church should have been drawn up in *Greek*, as soon after the period in which the Epistle was written, as Liturgical Offices were composed, although not understood by the people. Or, as that Epistle was written to the Roman Church when Latin was the vernacular tongue of the western world, by parity of reasoning, whenever that language ceased to exist, the praying in it should have ceased also. The similitude, therefore, does not hold.

Had the Roman Pontiffs allowed divine worship to be celebrated in the language known to the people, when the decline of the Roman Empire had brought on the extinction of the Latin language, and had not been influenced by a superstitious veneration for it, because it bore the stamp of antiquity; or by other motives less worthy: they would not have incurred the Apostolic censure. What St. Paul says on the subject to the Corinthians, is so pointedly directed against the usage of the Popish Church, that it is surprising how Doctor Milner could have imagined, that the circumstance already stated afforded it a sanction. We should recollect, that the Corinthian Church principally consisted of *Jews*, and that, although the service was divided between two or three officiating ministers; they still retained the use

of the *Hebrew*, to which they were familiarized. To this St. Paul does not object, provided an interpreter *be present*. The Apostle thus reasons:—* “If, then, I know not the virtue of the voice, I shall be to him to whom I speak, barbarous; and he that speaketh, *barbarous* to me. But, if thou bless in the spirit, he that supplieth the place of the vulgar, how shall he say AMEN upon thy blessing, because he knoweth not what thou sayest?” From this passage, indeed, as well as from the whole of the chapter in which it occurs, it may be collected, that the Corinthian Church had fallen into the practice of the Jewish synagogue; in short, that it had † *judaized* in this particular, and had therefore excited the Apostle’s displeasure.

Doctor Milner grounds a *second* argument in

* RHEMISH VERSION, 1 Cor. xiv. 11, 16. In conformity with this reasoning, St. Paul is said (Acts, xxi. 40.) to have addressed the Jews of Jerusalem, « Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλεκτῷ.

† LIGHTFOOT, in his *Horæ Hebræicæ*, observes, “Quamvis autem tam utilis foret linguæ Hebrææ usus apud hos ministros, erat tamen et *abusus* aliquis quem castigat Apostolus suspicor eos in hac re *judaizasse* atque usum linguæ Hebrææ, quamvis vulgo ignotæ, in Ecclesiâ retinuisse, consuetudinem sequutos *Synagogæ*.”—Vol. ii. p. 918, in Epist. 1 ad Corin. The same author again says, “Memini magnam partem Ecclesiæ Corinthiacæ *constitisse ex Judæis*, non possum non suspicari et ministros eorum eâdem linguâ usos quam rem quidem tolerat Apostolus, modo adsit *Interpres*, uti etiam in Synagoga est factum.”—Ibid. p. 919.

favour of the Popish practice, on the attendance of Christ at the Jewish service in the Temple, and in the Synagogue. He says, * “that although that service was performed in a language which the vulgar did not understand, yet that our Saviour never *censured* it.” But this argument is of the same description as that derived from the Epistle to the Romans, having been written in Greek. It is true, that Christ, but with different motives from those of approbation or disapprobation of what was going forward, joined with the Jews in their religious worship, being that in which he was bred up. For † St. Luke tells us, that our Lord read to the people part of Esaias, which was prophetic of himself; and that after preaching to them, “the eyes of *all* them in the Synagogue were fastened on him;” and “that *all* bare him witness.” Now, how could they have done so, or have “wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth:” had they been unacquainted with the language in which he spoke? And if, on the sabbath days, “they were astonished at his doctrine;” we must equally conclude, that he addressed them in the language, which they understood.

On referring to ‡ Basnage’s continuation of

* LETTER xlviii. p. 149. † IV. 17, 22, 32.

‡ BOOK v. p. 456.

Josephus, we may perceive the foundation of Doctor Milner's argument laid in a conjecture of Voisin; but which that author does not support. * "They pride themselves," says he, "at Rome, in the conformity of this Church with the Synagogue, about the Jews praying in a *strange* tongue; for as they perform their service in *Latin*, by order of the Pope, the Jews make their prayers in *Hebrew*, which is the language of the great Sanhedrim." But Basnage remarks, that this conformity is quite chimerical, as the Jews neither performed their service in an *unknown* tongue; nor was there a *decree* of the Sanhedrim to that effect. He admits, no doubt, "that they do not all understand Hebrew, but they have forms of prayer in the language they *understand*. There needs but little use and custom to prevent being mistaken, and to answer AMEN with *understanding* as St. Paul requires." He afterwards adds, that the Hebrew language was not extinct, "since the Jews, at this day, write their books and contracts, and journals, in the language of the Rabbies, and that those of the Morea use it generally for every thing." It is therefore evident, to demonstration, that Doctor Milner overstrains the parallel, which he institutes be-

* VOISIN—*Pugna Fidei*, p. 157.

tween the Jewish and Romish Churches, so far as their respective Liturgies are concerned.

Besides, he is aware, that portions of the Scripture were read to the people in the Synagogue from the Hebrew Bible; that these were afterwards expounded to them *verse by verse, in the language which they *understood*; that the attention of Ezra and Nehemiah was specially directed to this point; that the Levites † “gave the sense, and caused them to *understand* the reading;” and, that if from the length of their captivity, they nearly lost the knowledge of the Hebrew, and acquired the Chaldee; yet, that this was rather a variation of, than a different language from the other. Every thing that was done, had a reference to the *instruction* of the people. Is it, therefore, natural to suppose, that when such pains were taken to make them acquainted with the Scriptures, that they should be left in utter ignorance about the meaning of their prayers?

‡ Lightfoot tells us, that “every Synagogue had its own interpreter to translate into the *ver-*

* “Nec licet lectori præire interpreti plures versus quam unum.”—VITRINGA de Synagogâ vetere, cap. xii. p. 1019.

† Nehemiah, viii. 8.

‡ “Unaquæque Synagoga interpretem suum sortita est, qui in *vernaculam* linguam redderet quæcunque ex lege seu prophetis, secundum autographa, perlegi solebant.”—Vol. ii. p. 135.

naacular language, whatever was usually read from the law, or the prophets, according to the autographs." Besides, the elders required every man to have the original Scriptures as well as the *Targums*, which would enable him to understand them. But he is equally satisfactory on the subject of their prayers, when he says, "that they were composed in the Chaldee language, * that *all* might understand." And † Prideaux informs us, that the *Prayers of Ezra*, which every age and sex were required to ‡ repeat three times a day, were deemed a "fundamental and principal part of their Offices." But, if we refer to the testimony of || Nehemiah himself, our doubts must vanish; for the Levites, according to him, used to cry out with a loud voice, "stand up and *bless* the Lord your God for ever and ever." This single circumstance shews, that the people knew both the forms of prayer and the language in which they were required to *bless*; while it rationally accounts for the passiveness of our Saviour on the occasion. Indeed, were this not the case, were no inter-

* "Ut omnes *intelligerent*."—*IBID.* p. 919. See also PRIDEAUX, *ut supra*.

† Vol. ii. part ii. p. 414.

‡ "Every private person among the Jews," says Basnage, "is obliged to repeat a *hundred benedictions* a day."—*HIST. of the Jews*, book v. p. 454.

|| IX. 5.

preter to explain, and no instruction imparted; were there nothing but idle shew accompanied with unintelligible sounds, as in the Church of Rome at the present day; instead of a tacit acquiescence in what took place in the Temple and the Synagogue; there can be no doubt, but that our Lord would have been more decided in his condemnation of it, than St. Paul afterwards was in the case of the Corinthian Christians.

I therefore conclude, that no plea is reserved to Doctor Milner for justifying the custom which prevails in the Romish service. Had the Apostles, indeed, been influenced by such a desire as he seems to have, of praying in a tongue not to the edification of the people, and had they accordingly adopted either the old or new Hebrew in their forms of prayer, then, indeed, the resemblance would have been most marked; but as the matter stands, there is none whatever.

We find Origen, in the third century, observing, that every person prays to God in *his own* tongue; * “that the Greeks used the *Greek*, and the Romans, the *Roman* language, in their PRAYERS.” The † history of the sixth century tells us, that when some of the super-

* Εν ταῖς εὐχαῖς οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΙΣ χροῶνται, οἱ δὲ ῥωμαῖοι ΡΩΜΑΙΚΟΙΣ.—Orig. contra Cels. Lib. viii. p. 402.

† See BINGHAM's Antiquities, Book xiii. chap. iv. p. 580. Also, BURNET, Art. xxiv.

stitious Jews wished the Law to be read only in the Hebrew, then *not understood* by the people; while others contended for its being read in Greek, or in any other language *known* to them, the wise Justinian decided in favour of the latter, and thus at once checked the innovation as soon as it was perceived to be gaining ground in the Jewish synagogue. At that period the Christian Church was *free* from this corruption. So late as the seventeenth century, the state of the Jews in Barbary, no less than their customs, secular and religious, is minutely detailed by Doctor Addison. * “Those,” he remarks, “which cannot read the service in the Hebrew, who are but *few*, are bound when to learn to say AMEN.” And, if we look to the existing custom of even the *Romish* churches in the province of Madura, we shall find, that † “the priest reads the *Syrian* mass, instead of the Latin, which he *does not understand*.”

Doctor Milner’s *third* argument is, “that the Greek churches, like the Latin, retain their original Greek in their Liturgy, although the common people have forgotten it.” When he referred to ‡ Mosheim, for the usages of the Eastern Christians, he should in candour, have prefaced his reference with the severe censure

* London edit. 1676.

† PEARSON’S MEMOIRS OF DOCTOR BUCHANAN, vol. ii. p. 16.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 575.

pronounced by that historian on “the Roman Pontiff’s, who, with the most senseless obstinacy, retained the use of the *Latin* language in the celebration of divine worship, even *when it was no longer understood* by the people.” Had Doctor Milner done so, he might then have added, “that the same absurd principle on which the Popish Church acts, produced a similar effect among the Egyptian Christians, who perform their religious service in the ancient Coptic language; among the Nestorians, who use the Syriac; and among the Abyssinians, who adopt the old Ethiopic; although these languages have been long unintelligible to the people.” But, how can the prevalence of a practice, which is inconvenient and absurd in principle, justify a continuance of it, when Scripture, reason, and common sense, condemn it; and when history attests, that every Christian Church originally had a Liturgy in its native tongue?

CHAPTER XIX.

PROHIBITION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

TO the unrestricted use of the Scriptures, Doctor Milner takes all the exceptions which were laid down by the Council of Trent. While he admits, that the revealed truths of the Bible are to be made known as much as possible, yet, he says, that it does not hence follow, that * “*all* are to read the Scriptures;” that this indulgence is only to be extended to those who adduce “some attestation of their piety and docility;” and that, for the use of persons so disposed, “the English version of the Romish Bible is exposed to sale in all sizes—folio, quarto, and octavo;” against which, Bishop Tomline has no other objection to make, “except that it is *too literal*, that is, too faithful.” Here is an explicit avowal, that the Church of Rome does not permit its laity to read the Bible in their mother tongue, without special permission to do so. This admission is the more valuable, considering the authority of the person

* LETTER xlvii. p. 152.

who makes it; since it has been erroneously supposed, that that Church has relaxed in its opposition to the diffusion of the Scriptures. No; the spirit in which the RULE prohibiting the use of the Scriptures was conceived and published by Pius IV., in whose Pontificate the Council of Trent finished its sittings, continues in full force to this day. It is *this Rule*, which Popish writers give as the apology of their Church for the rigorous enforcement of its decrees.

The reader will perceive, as it stands in the * original, that the license must be in writing, and that it relates to the Bible simply. Another Rule ordains, that whoever dared to read, or possess a Bible without this licence, and did not surrender it to his Ordinary, could not receive Absolution. This power of granting licences was afterwards wholly withdrawn by the Church of Rome, and if restored, it was with a still greater limitation than that laid down in the original Rule, viz. that the editions of the Bible should be subject to the † appro-

* “Eis concedere possint, quos parochi vel confessarii, intellexerint ex hujusmodi lectione, non damnum, sed fidei atque pietatis augmentum capere posse; quam facultatem *in scriptis* habeant.”—REGULA IVta P. Pii IV.

† “Quod si hujusmodi Bibliorum versiones vulgari linguâ fuerint ab Apostolicâ Sede approbatæ, aut editæ cum annotationibus desumptis ex sanctis patribus, vel ex doctis catholicisque viris, *conceduntur*.”

bation of the Holy See. These rules extend to books of * controversy. When, therefore, Doctor Milner speaks of “the vulgar translations of the whole Scripture being *upon sale, and open to every one*,” it is mere idle talk, as long as such Rules as these are in existence, and enforced with rigour; inasmuch as that does not prove that *every* Roman Catholic is permitted to read them. And, even before we can form an opinion, that any particular man will be allowed this indulgence, we should know what his confessor’s judgment is on the subject; as it is both in his, and in his Bishop’s power, to lock them up, or to make them a sealed volume to any individual they think proper. From what we know of the lower orders of the Roman Catholics in this country, we may safely aver, that the Scriptures are to them a dead letter, and as little known as if they never appeared in print.

With respect to what Bishop Tomline says about the Donay Old, and the Rhemish New Testaments, I cannot think it possible that Doctor Milner could have had his Lordship’s Ele-

* “*Libri de controversiis non passim permittuntur, sed idem de iis servetur, quod de Bibliis vulgari lingua scriptis statutum est.*” In illustration of this rule, I may specify the *Defence of the Ancient Faith*, by the Rev. PETER GANDOLPHY, a work which was at first approved by the Papal See, but afterwards, through Doctor Poynter’s influence, condemned, until the author made humble submission to that Right Rev. Vicar Apostolic.

ments of Theology before him when he quoted him, not as disapproving, but as highly commending those versions of the Scriptures. He represents that Prelate as saying, "that they are *too literal*," an expression bespeaking their merit, as it implies, "that they are *too faithful*," which, in the Doctor's mind, constitutes the excellence of a translation. But so far is his Lordship from saying any thing commendatory of the English Bible of the Church of Rome, that he pointedly censures it; or rather, on the authority of Fuller, denies that it is a translation at all. The translators, says he, * "retained in it many Eastern, Greek, and Latin words, and contrived to render it unintelligible to common readers." Now, as by possibility, Doctor Milner may hold up as admirers of that version, those who agree in opinion with his Lordship; as one of them, I most distinctly declare, that I not only concur with the Bishop of Winchester in what he has said on the subject, but that I subscribe to the opinions delivered by Fulke, Fuller, and Johnson, as well as by the venerable translators of our own authorized Translation, respecting it.

* BISHOP OF WINCHESTER'S Elem. of Theol. vol. ii. p. 16. Fulke, Fuller, Lewis, Johnson, Archbishop Newcome, and Geddes, no less than our own authorized Translators, pronounce the Douay Bible, a *barbarous* translation from the Vulgate before its last revision, accompanied with *acrimonious* and *injurious* annotations.

But, much as I lament to see the Scriptures veiled in obscurity, and rendered unintelligible to common readers, my regret is heightened by the republication of the offensive and uncharitable * notes, which first accompanied the Rhemish Testament. Were it ever once supposed that the Church of Rome had abandoned its bigotted and unchristian dogmas, the last Dublin edition of the English Bible, published under the auspices of Doctor Troy, would produce conviction on the mind of every unprejudiced person, of the hopeless fallacy of such a supposition. This volume, when the Church of Rome interprets it according to its own tradition, is held forth as containing the rule of *faith* and *practice*, and as uniting, at the same time, *scripture* and *tradition*; the former in the text, and the latter in the notes. When I consider this, and the high authority under which it circulates among the Irish public; and that it unfolds, in its long, *pious*, and *enriching* annotations, as they are called in the R. C. Orthodox Journal of October, 1817, the comprehensive principle of the infallibility of Popish councils and their decrees: I cannot but feel alarmed at the mischievous tendency of those selfsame *pious* and *enriching* notes, and at the spirit of persecution which pervades them.

If we refer to recent occurrences, we shall

* See PREFATORY REMARKS, p. xvii.

see the present Supreme Pontiff, notwithstanding the mildness of his character, denouncing in his * LETTER to the Titular Bishops of Ireland, what he calls “Bible Schools,” and stigmatizing our Received Version of the Scriptures, as “abounding with errors,” and our Bible Societies, as endeavouring to infect our peasantry “with the fatal poison of depraved doctrine:” when we see in the † BRIEF recently transmitted from Rome, a repetition, if not of the same language, at least, of the same sentiments: when we see those Titular Bishops, in their collective capacity, coming to a ‡ Resolution, “that the New Testament, or any part of the Scripture, *with*, or *without* note or comment, is not a fit or proper book to be used in schools:” when, || individually, they act up to this Resolution in their respective dioceses: and lastly, when we

* This LETTER, dated September 18th, 1819, and signed by CARDINAL FONTANA, is referred to by Mr. Brougham in his eloquent speech on *National Education*, June 28th, 1820.

† The BRIEF is addressed to the R. C. Prelates of Ireland by the Holy See, dated August 11th, 1820, and signed by CARDINAL SOMAGLIA. It represents our Bible as “*pregnant with errors*,” and the Bible Society as tainting the indigent classes “with the *deadly poison* of perverse doctrine.”

‡ See Dublin Journal of February 7th, 1820.

|| The R. C. Bishops, Coppinger, Kelly, Doyle, &c. &c. have, in their respective Pastoral Letters and Sermons, also forbidden their Congregations to read the Scriptures, *with*, or *without* notes!!

see the * Bishop of Castabala himself applauding this whole affair, can we be surprised at the little progress of religious knowledge among our lower orders; or, that Mr. Brougham, when he developed his admirable system of Education, should have considered it inapplicable to Ireland.

And here I must take leave to make an observation on the Hibernian Society, and its Auxiliary Branches, as at present constituted. I do so solely from a regard to my own principles as an orthodox clergyman of the Established Church. Much as I condemn the restrictions imposed by the Church of Rome on the free circulation of the Scriptures; and although it be an object nearest my own heart, to afford them the widest dissemination possible; yet I must declare, that I am far from being indifferent about the medium, through which this is to be carried into effect. It is urged, and with justice, that an Association composed of Churchmen, and all denominations of Dissenters, has a necessary tendency to produce an apathy about the vital doctrines of Christianity

* Doctor Milner, V. A. for the middle district of England, speaks thus in his Pastoral Letter of 1803. "This study, indeed, (that of the Holy Scriptures) is not required of all the faithful indiscriminately, *as the Church has declared*, because there are in this mysterious Code things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction, and are to receive the word of God broken and prepared for their digestion at the hand of their Pastors."

in our Church; that those persons, whose principles may not be fixed, are more likely to become a prey to false opinions, in consequence of this heterogeneous mixture; and that * Dissenters will undoubtedly follow up the circulation of the Scriptures, with all their influence, for the purpose of propagating their peculiar tenets. As I feel the full force of these objections, for one I should be happy to see the dissolution of this unnatural connexion taking place, and the Churchmen, who are members of this Society, either attaching themselves to the Parent Association, that for discountenancing Vice; or forming a distinct one of Churchmen with Churchmen, and leaving the Dissenters, if they please, to imitate their example. Were this to take place, and were the new Society to accompany the distribution of the Bible, with a † Prayer Book,

* Under the denomination of Dissenters, I class our Evangelical clergy, who only adhere to our church, because of the consequent adhesion of ecclesiastical benefits to themselves. But with what inconsistency, to say the least of it, do they act, in thus engrossing emoluments, and at the same time, in violating the terms, on the faith of which the Church of England conferred them.

† It is not a little gratifying to me to find my own opinion on this subject fortified by such high authority as that of Bishop Mant. His Lordship also recommends, a diligent, but judicious distribution of the Holy Bible, *accompanied* by the Book of Common Prayer; while he disapproves of a *boundless* circulation of it without regard to circumstances. CHARGE, pp. 48, 49.

as a safeguard against the delusions of Calvinistic interpretation; we should see the same blessed effects follow from the proposed alteration in the frame of our Hibernian Bible Society, as have been so fondly anticipated from the new-modelling of the British and Foreign Bible Society, by some of the most orthodox and learned Divines of the present day.

CHAPTER XX.

CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY.

I SHOULD not have adverted to this subject, had not Doctor Milner, by a misstatement of the fact, thought proper to involve me in a serious contradiction. Speaking of the text of St. Matthew, (* ου παντες χωρουσι τον λογον τουτον, Matt. xix. 11.) he says, that when *cannot* is put for *do not* in the translation, the sense of the passage is altered; and that, although this corruption stands in direct opposition to the original, † “as the REV. MR. GRIER himself quotes it, yet this writer has the confidence to deny, that it is a corruption; because *he pretends to prove*, from other texts, that *continency is not necessary*.” It would be painful to me, to designate this representation by the title it deserves. I shall, therefore, content myself with barely repeating, that it is a misstatement. I have not proved it, either directly, or by implication;

* Doctor Milner renders it, “All men *do not* receive this saying.” In the RHEM. TRANSLATION, it is, “Not all take this word.” OUR AUTHORIZED ENG. TRANSL. has it, “All men *cannot* receive this saying.”

† LETTER ix. p. 72.

nor have I affected to prove, that continency is *not* necessary. This I can affirm with the utmost confidence, as I have re-examined the arguments, which I advanced on the subject, with the closest attention. In fact, the contested point between Ward and me, did not require either of us to come to the decision about continency being, or *not being* necessary; inasmuch as it is on all hands admitted to be an ornament and grace of the sacerdotal character.

The question is simply this, whether our Saviour's words, as above stated, make it imperative on the ministers in his Church to lead a life of celibacy, or not. Had Doctor Milner only substituted *celibacy* for continency, I should readily plead guilty to the charge, either, that I proved, or attempted to prove, that *celibacy was not necessary*. A reference to the * book itself will satisfy the reader, that in the refutation of the objection to our Received Version of the above text, I have involved any future ones, which may be raised against its correctness. In truth, Doctor Milner's cavil is in substance the same as Ward's, and only varies from it as being couched in a more artful form of expression.

But, neither the text quoted by Ward from St. Matthew, nor that adduced by Doctor Milner from St. Paul, determines either as to

* See ANSWER to Ward, pp. 33 and 2

the possibility or impossibility of leading a life of continency; and when I thus explicitly say so, I trust, I shall not be again represented by Doctor Milner as *pretending* to prove, “that continency *is not* necessary.” The fact is, that it is no where stated in Scripture, that continency proceeds from man’s free will; while it makes express mention of it here, and in other texts, as being the *gift* of God. It were, indeed, superfluous, even for the best men, to ask it as a divine favour, if they could impart it to themselves. Besides, that which every man may, by ordinary means, obtain, cannot be called a *special* gift; that is, a gift proper to some, which the words, “to whom it is given,” imply.

Not to speak of St. Peter’s being a * married man, and that our Saviour did not consider this circumstance as a disqualification to his becoming an Apostle, we have abundant proof afforded us by Archbishop Usher, that celibacy was not generally imposed upon the clergy in ancient times. Even from the *Irish* records, he produces a manuscript containing St. Patrick’s confession, that † “his father, Calphurnius, was a *deacon*, and his grandfather, Poti-

* Matt. viii. 14.

† “Patrem habui Calphurnium *Diaconum* filium quondam Potiti *Presbyteri*.”—Archbishop USHER’S DISCOURSE on the Religion of the Ancient Irish, p. 145.

tus, a *priest*;" and quotes Gildas, a writer of the sixth century, as censuring the Bishops in the *British* Church, "that they were not content to be the husband of one, but *many* wives; and that they had corrupted their children by their evil example." * He likewise informs us, on the authority of Giraldus Cambrensis, that, in the twelfth century, the British and Welsh clergy contrived to make their *sons* succeed them as well in their spiritual as in their temporal estates. In the beginning of the thirteenth century, the letters of Pope Innocent the Third, to his Cardinal Legate, shew, that this abuse prevailed even to a greater degree in Ireland. Here is a mass of testimony to prove, that, although that imperious Pontiff, Gregory VII., had subjected the Church to the Papal See, by enforcing the celibacy of the clergy on the continent; yet that, for upwards of a century after his time, † "sons and grandchildren used to succeed their fathers and grandfathers in *their ecclesiastical benefices*," in these islands.

Finding evidence so strong against him, Doctor Milner attempts to invalidate it, by impeaching Archbishop Usher's character, on the ground of *unfairness* in suppressing what he should have told. Thus, ‡ says he, "if the learned Primate had acted *fairly* by his readers, he

* *Ibid.* p. 54.

† *Ibid.* p. 55.

‡ *INQUIRY*, p. 149.

would have informed them, that the same author, who mentions these particulars, concerning St. Patrick's family, expressly tells us, that the children of Calphurnius and Potitus were born *previously to their father's ordination*." It is true, were this charge fully established against the Archbishop, it would lessen the * reliance placed on his general accuracy and candour. But, Doctor Milner has not only miserably failed in his attack on that great man, but has been unable to sustain what he asserts on the authority of Joceline himself, weak as his authority is considered to be. For, in the first place, it may be seen from the preceding paragraph, that Usher does not refer to Joceline, but to the Manuscript containing the confession of St. Patrick. So that, although Doctor Milner were correct in what he gives as Joceline's words, still his charge against Usher would be unfounded. And secondly, Doctor Milner is unable to point out the place where Joceline "expressly tells us," that St. Patrick was born *before* the ordination of his father, Calphurnius;

* DOCTOR O'CONOR, who was eminently qualified to pronounce upon the accuracy of Archbishop Usher's quotations, thus expresses himself.—"Having diligently perused all the printed works and many of the MS. Letters of that great man, I can with truth declare for him, what I *cannot* with truth say for the Bishop of Castabala, that I *never* yet discovered a false reference to *any* MS., or to *any* printed book, in any of his writings."—COLUMBANUS ad Hibernos, Letter iii. p. 50.

as that author only says, that * “ his Parents relinquished the use of the marriage-bed, and died holily in the lord.” This does not determine the ordination of Calphurnius to have taken place *after* his separation from his wife, as Doctor Milner insinuates; it rather goes to prove that Calphurnius was a *deacon* when St. Patrick was begotten. On the whole, therefore, it appears, that the accusation brought against Usher is not sustained by historical evidence, and that Joceline’s testimony, poor as it is, which Doctor Milner has cited for the purpose of disparaging a married life, justifies, so far as it goes, the account given by Usher of celibacy among the clergy being unknown in the early ages of the church.

If we must determine the origin of this innovation, we shall have to trace it to the monkery of the dark ages. To the ambitious Hildebrand, (Gregory VII.) are we to attribute its establishment. Indeed to such a man could it alone belong to subject the Church to the See of Rome, and then to compel temporal Princes to submit to the Church. We know, gigantic as the enterprize was, how successfully it was executed. By emancipating the Church

* “ Castitati studuerunt parentes Sti Patricii, nempe Calphurnius et Conquessa; Calphurnius autem prius in *Diaconatu* diutius Domino servivit, postremo in *presbyteratu* vitam finivit.”
JOCELIN. Vita Sti. Pat. c. 1.

from the temporal power, this haughty Pontiff was enabled to destroy the dependence of the Ecclesiastics on their respective Sovereigns, and thus to turn the mental energies of that vast body of men to the exclusive advancement of his individual interests. To no purpose did the German and French Bishops denounce the papal decree, as requiring what was repugnant to the word of God, and the doctrine of the Apostles. And in vain did they urge their liability to the same temptations and infirmities as other men. Gregory was inflexible, and their resistance but rendered his triumph more complete. He deprived them of their benefices, excommunicated them, pronounced their children bastards, and their wives concubines: and thus gaining the ascendant over every finer feeling of the heart, he might boast, that shame, fear, and avarice, reduced the clergy to his subjection, rather than a sense of duty. This state of things, after a duration of more than four centuries, was happily terminated, wherever the blessings of the Reformation were felt, and an ecclesiastical polity established, which was more consonant to the early usages of Christianity.

CHAPTER XXI.

EXCLUSIVE CATHOLICITY.

HAVING *already discussed the subject of the baneful schisms, which, for upwards of half a century, disgraced the Church of Rome in the very seat of its pretended sanctity and infallibility ; and having proved from the existence of those † schisms, that if unity be a mark of the true Church of Christ, the Romish Church is *not* that true Church ; it only remains for me to observe with respect to the other *exclusive* characteristics, which Doctor Milner claims for it, that history attests, that it is not the *most ancient*, while it destroys its pretensions to *holiness* ; and that the novelties and heterodoxies in its faith, with which it is encumbered, demonstrate, that it is not *apostolical*, except as to its

* See PREFATORY REMARKS, p. xxvi—xxix.

† That, distinguished by the name of the *Great Western Schism*, began in 1378, after the death of Gregory XI., and ended in 1428. For *fifty* years, during which this dissension was fomented with such fatal success, the Church of Rome had two or three different heads at the same time ; a circumstance, which does away all its claims to *Unity, Sanctity, and Infallibility*.—MOSH. ECCL. HIST. vol. iii. p. 316—328.

origin and form of Government; while a reference to geography will prove, that it is not CATHOLIC, or UNIVERSAL.

On looking to the extent of the See of Rome, or the Pope's jurisdiction, about the time of the Reformation, when Popery was most general, we shall find, that it did not occupy more than one-fourth part of Christendom. If his Supremacy extended at that time over Great Britain and Ireland, and several states of the Continent of Europe, it was excluded from the Russian Empire, and not acknowledged by the Greek, Syrian, and Armenian Churches, and other branches of the Asiatic and African Churches: But from the view which Doctor Milner gives of * "the present diffusiveness of (Roman) Catholics," although greatly abridged since the above period; his reader would be led to imagine, that in Europe alone, they were to Protestants in the proportion of *six* to *one*; and that they were almost the only Christians to be found throughout the other quarters of the world! Here, however, his usual disregard to accuracy betrays itself; since, according to a correct † statistical account lately published in France, of the population, and of the different denominations of Christians in Europe, the Roman

* LETTER XXVI. p. 109.

† See *Schoell's Tableau*, &c., as quoted in *The DUBLIN JOURNAL*, Nov. 17, 1819.

Catholics are to the Protestants of different Communions, in a ratio of somewhat less than *two and a half* to *two*; the former being stated at *one hundred*, and the latter at *forty-two* millions. Now, if to these *forty-two* millions be added *thirty-two* millions of what the French calculator calls *schismatic* Greeks; meaning those not in communion with, or under the jurisdiction of the Papal See; and likewise upwards of half a million of Christians of other denominations, including Herrnhutters, Menonists, &c. &c. who equally protest against Popish errors; the gross number of all those sects dissentient from the Church of Rome, would amount to somewhat more than *seventy-four millions and a half*. According to which calculation, the proportion of Roman Catholics in Europe, to other Christians of different denominations, would be somewhat less than *one and a third*, to *one*.

Again, were I to admit that the Christian converts and settlers in North and South America, are in communion with the See of Rome; yet what becomes of Doctor Milner's *exclusive* Catholicity with reference to the Churches in Africa and Asia? If we direct our attention to the oriental ones alone, we shall find even on the coast of Malabar, *one hundred Christian

* In Doctor Buchanan's account of the Syrian Churches, we find that in the region of Hindostan alone, there are *fifty-*

Churches, with the purity and simplicity of whose worship, Doctor Buchanan informs us, the Portuguese adventurers were, on their first visit, offended. Here we find a race of Christians maintaining the order and discipline of a regular Church under Episcopal jurisdiction, and enjoying a succession of Bishops appointed by the Patriarch of Antioch for *thirteen* centuries before those freebooters came among them. Will Doctor Milner allow, that those Christians were Catholic, before the terrors of the Inquisition reduced them to submission to the church of Rome; or, that those of them are Catholic, who have since resumed, under British protection, the exercise of their own pure and unadulterate religion?

* "The Syrian Churches," said Vasco de Gama, "belong to the Pope. Who is the Pope, asked the natives: we *never* heard of him? We, added they, are of the true faith, whatever you from the West may be; for we come from the place where the followers of Christ were first called Christians." The same may be said of the Asiatic Christians in general, who, not only were not subject to the Pope, but who never

are Churches agreeing in essential points with those of the Church of England. They have the Bible and a Scriptural Liturgy, which have preserved the vital spark of Christianity among them.—See *Christian Researches*, p. 117.

* *IBID.* p. 107.

so much as once heard his name mentioned. This was the state of things in 1503, when the Portuguese first visited the East; and even when Doctor Buchanan wrote his account of the Syrian Churches in India, they were independent from the Papal See, and disclaimed a connexion with it, with the exception of such as were under the control of Portugal and Spain. * And if, as has been shewn, the Syrian Church be a distinct and an independent branch of the *Catholic* or universal Church of Christ, what *exclusive* pretensions to Catholicity can the Roman Church have, since both are equally of Apostolical foundation? It follows, therefore, as an inevitable consequence, that the Church of Rome is not only *not exclusively* Catholic, but that, were the Syrian Church to put forward like pretensions to Catholicity, they would be equally well founded. They are both branches of Christ's Catholic or Universal Church; and are each independent from the other. The same may be said of the Greek and British Churches, &c. &c.

In justice to the character of Doctor Bucha-

* According to Doctor Buchanan, Christianity in the *Romish* Provinces in the East, is in the most degraded state, owing to the corruptions of Popery. Of the Priests, he says, "that they are in general better acquainted with the *Veda* of *Brahma*, than with the Gospel of Christ. In some places, the doctrines of both are *blended*."—*Ibid.* p. 153.

nan, I am compelled to notice a misrepresentation made by Doctor Milner of what that writer says respecting the power of the Romish Church in India. The number of the Roman Catholics, did not, as Doctor Milner avers, * “excite either the jealousy, or the complaints of that celebrated Missionary.” Not a word of complaint, nor an expression of jealousy occurs in the place quoted; nor is there even an allusion in it to the *number* of Roman Catholics resident in the Peninsula within the Ganges. Doctor Buchanan’s sole object was to secure the co-operation of the Syrian Church, in order to counteract the influence of the See of Rome, and if possible, to effect an union of that Church with the Church of England. This was all he aimed at. But it suited Doctor Milner’s purpose to misrepresent, even at the risk of detection, and accordingly, he has misrepresented.

But, as Doctor Buchanan has been quoted for what he has *not* said, I shall take leave to state what he *has* said, in the page referred to by Doctor Milner. The passage could not have escaped his notice; as it contains an interesting conversation on the subject of an union between the Syrian and British Church. The Chaplains of the Syrian Bishop asked, † “Whence

* LETTER xxvi. p. 111.

† CHRISTIAN RESEARCHES, p. 131.

do you derive your ordination? From * Rome. You derive it, said they, from a Church which is our ancient enemy, and with which we would *never* unite." They further remarked, that, admitting that the same ordination with their own had descended from the Apostles of that Church; yet, that "*it had departed from the faith.*" Such was the opinion of some of the members of that pure and ancient Church, whose Scriptures, doctrines, and language; in short, whose very existence, are standing memorials of its Apostolic origin: which never was in connection with the See of Rome, and which, when an union was proposed to it, rejected it with indignation and scorn.

One or two of Doctor Milner's arguments in favour of his exclusive Catholicity, remain to be noticed, which, if they do not convince,

* The late publications of the Bishop of St. David's, and of the Rev. Doctor Hales, on the Origin and Independence of the British and Irish Churches from the Church of Rome, afford satisfactory proof, that British Ordination was derived from St. Paul, and descended in the British Church, in direct succession, to the beginning of the twelfth century. And, although the Saxon Church derived ordination from Rome, through Austin, the first Archbishop of Canterbury, and that the British Church, on its submission, was united with it at that period under the common title of the Church of England; yet, had Doctor Buchanan been acquainted with the former circumstance, so satisfactorily proved by the above-named divines, he need not have at all alarmed the Syrian clergy with the mention of the Church of Rome.

will at least amuse the reader. "When," says he, "a Protestant repeats, I believe in the CATHOLIC Church, should I ask him, are you a *Catholic*? He is sure to answer me, No, I am a Protestant." Again, "were a stranger to ask his way in London to the *Catholic* chapel, no sober Protestant would direct him to any other place of worship than *ours*." These are, according to him, "glaring instances of Protestant inconsistency and self-condemnation." But such reasoning, if reasoning it can be called, carries with it its own refutation. As no well-informed Protestant ever supposes the Catholic Church, in which he expresses *his belief*, to be any other than Christ's Church UNIVERSAL. And if, in the ordinary intercourse of life, Protestants unguardedly speak of the *Catholic* chapel, the *Catholic* question, or the *Catholic* population, they use that term, if they attach any meaning at all to it, not in reference to its ecclesiastical sense, but as a *synonyme* of *Roman Catholic*. The advantage, however, which Popish writers take of this indifference, and the additional claim to *exclusive* Catholicity, which they affect to establish on this verbal inaccuracy, would, if duly considered by the Protestant community, lead to the total disuse of the word * *Catholic* in the way spoken of. In

* I have already had occasion to protest against Doctor Milner's right to apply the term *Catholic* exclusively to the

truth, were that epithet acknowledged to be appropriate to the Church of Rome, and contradistinguished in meaning to that of *Protestant*, it would inevitably follow, that the Protestant Church was not within the pale of the Catholic Church of Christ; a consequence which even many of our liberalists would be reluctant to admit.

Towards the conclusion of his Letter on Catholicity, Doctor Milner remarks, that Protestants have *no way* of accounting for the change of the pure religion of the primitive ages, for the new and false system, which they call Popery, at whatever period it may be fixed, "but by supposing, that the whole collection of Christians, on some one night, went to bed Protestants, and awoke the next morning Papists!" This is wit with a vengeance. The facetious Doctor reminds me of those persons who draw on their memories for that article, as they do on their imaginations for argument; for, poor as the joke is, it has not even the merit of originality. But surely the idea was never

members of the Church of Rome, in my remarks on his sermon preached at the consecration of the Popish church of St. Chad's, in the town of Birmingham, in 1809. The quibbles which he then published on the subject, closely resemble those, which appear in his *End of Controversy*—See ANSWER to Ward, Preface, p. xxxiv.; and Preface to this Work, towards the end.

once entertained, that the corruptions of Christianity were of instantaneous growth, or that the Church of Rome had contracted them in a day, a year, or even in a century. Be this as it may, my wish is, that all the members of its communion may, after their next night's sleep, awake Protestants, and that the Church to which they belong, may imitate the modest and unassuming demeanour of the Church of England, and ever feel itself under the influence of that meek and tolerant spirit—that genuine *Christian charity*, which is the unerring mark and criterion of the TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

FINIS.



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

BX1751. M636EZ6



AA 000 632 341 4



